DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 707 SO 009 826

AUTHOR Schwartz, Edward
TITLE Building Community.
INSTITUTION Institute for the Study of Civic Values, Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Dolfinger-McMahon Foundation, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 176p.; Pages 57-64 of the original document are copyrighted and have been removed by ERIC. They are not included in the pagination
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 401 North Broad Street, Room 810, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108 ($3.00 paper cover)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Action Programs (Community); Adult Education; *Community Action; *Community Development; Course Descriptions; Crime; Curriculum; Justice; *Leadership Training; *Neighborhood Improvement; Social Action; Social Problems; Social Responsibility; Urban Environment; *Urban Studies; Values

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this eight-unit course is to explore the values and issues of modern urban neighborhoods. It focuses on how community leaders can apply the broad principle of justice to problems of security, reciprocity, and fellowship that face most neighborhoods today. The course is intended for use by community leaders in building community action organizations. Each unit presents essays, suggestions for further reading, and discussion questions. The first unit defines different types of communities, presents theoretical observations on community, and identifies major problems of urban neighborhoods. The second unit explores security through discussion of crime in Philadelphia, followed by a discussion of the relationship between reciprocity, privatism, and public policy in Unit three. The fourth unit presents essays on the value of community and religious fellowship. An examination of the importance of justice is presented in Units five through eight. Background material on the relevance of justice, traditions of justice, and social and corporate justice is followed by investigation of the relationship between justice, security, individual/community interests, and fellowship. Topics include child neglect, social class, neighborhood crime, ideal justice, criminal rehabilitation, economic conditions, cooperative self-help, and conflict resolution. A social contract technique for establishing political communities is described and an outline of sessions for discussing the eight units is presented. (Author/DB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED135707

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward A. Swartz
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

by Edward Schwartz

$3.00

Prepared by the
Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19108
215/WA2-8960

with selections by Sam Bass Warner, Jr., Saul Alinsky, Edward Banfield, Jane Jacobs, John Schaar, David R. Johnson, Suzanne Keller, St. Claire Drake and Horace Clayton, and Grover Sales.

Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108

Copyright © 1976, by the
Institute for the Study of Civic Values

Printed by the Philadelphia Resistance Print Shop
1116 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19123
A Unionized Printing Collective

Typeset by *Common Sense*
1116 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19123
A Community Newspaper and Typesetting Service

BUILDING COMMUNITY

By Edward Schwartz

Building Community is an eight-unit course aimed at exploring the values and issues of modern urban neighborhoods. It focuses on how community leaders can apply the broad principle of justice to problems of security, reciprocity, and fellowship that face most neighborhoods today.

Building Community has been made possible by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the William Penn Foundation, and the Dolfinger-McMahon Fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND SYLLABUS	p. 1
Social Contract Theory	1
Breakdown of Sessions	5
UNIT I: THE PRECONDITIONS OF COMMUNITY	p. 10
"Observations on Community," John Schaar	13
"The Uses of City Neighborhoods," Jane Jacobs	16
UNIT II: The Value of Security	27
UNIT III: THE VALUE OF RECIPROCITY	p. 44
"The Industrial Metropolis as an Inheritance," Sam Bass Warner, Jr.	44
"Neighbors and Neighboring," Suzanne Keller	58
'How Americans Combat Individualism by the Principle of Self-Interest, Rightly Understood," Alexis de Tocqueville	68
UNIT IV: THE VALUE OF FELLOWSHIP	p. 73
"Spirit of the Townships in New England," Alexis de Tocqueville	73
Religion and the Church," from *Black Metropolis*, by St. Clair Drake and Horace Clayton	76
UNIT V: THE IDEAL OF JUSTICE	p. 85
"Model of Christian Charity," John Winthrop	88
"Wealth," Andrew Carnegie	90
"Veto of Second National Bank," President Andrew Jackson	93
UNIT VI: JUSTICE AND SECURITY	p. 102
"The Future of the Lower Class," Edward Banfield	103
"John Maher of Delancey St.," Grover Sales	113
UNIT VII: JUSTICE AND RECIPROCITY	p. 127
"Making Johnny Learn," William Raspberry	127
"Organizing Money," Robert Creamer	133
"How Much Do People Make in Pennsylvania: Or, Who's Middle Class, Anyway?" Bill Callahan	142
UNIT VIII: JUSTICE AND FELLOWSHIP	p. 148
"How do you get People to Cooperate," Joe Falk	151
"Conflict Tactics," Saul Alinsky	154
"Plunkitt of Tammany Hall," William Riordin	167

INTRODUCTION AND SYLLABUS

A. Purpose

The aim of the course will be to help neighborhood leaders examine the possibilities of building active community organizations within neighborhoods in Philadelphia. Specifically, we will be exploring the common values upon which such organizations might be based. The first part of this course will explore expectations within neighborhoods about three areas of central concern to all communities--security, reciprocity, and fellowship. From there, the seminar will examine the central value that should govern all communities--justice. Then students will explore how different attitudes about justice will affect neighborhood attitudes on how to respond to issues of security, reciprocity, and justice. In practical terms, the first part of the seminar will identify the goals around which community organizations might form; the second part, assess the extent to which neighborhood residents agree on strategies to achieve these goals.

We divide the text into eight units. Readings will be provided for each unit, to be used as the basis for discussion. We also suggest several questions for these discussions. Yet as important as the questions is the social contract technique upon which they are based.

B. The Social Contract Theory

Community activists often complain about the breakdown of neighborhood values, but they have little idea as to how to restore them. Nor do current techniques in values education offer much to civic leaders in developing strong authority at the neighborhood level. "Values clarification," for example, aims at helping students tolerate differences in values and points of view, as well as to understand their own values. It does not provide for the development of common values that the students will take seriously as essential to social and political well-being.

The problem of cultivating collective values is hardly new, however. It is the central task of all political systems. If Americans have become so individualistic that we cannot even figure out how to share common principles, then perhaps we must return to the technique by which political communities are often established--the social contract.

Social contract theory dates back to the 17th and 18th centuries, during the earliest transformation between Monarchical and Parliamentary political systems. The first major contract theorist, Thomas Hobbes, argued that human beings in a "state of nature" would agree to a social contract pledging absolute obedience to a sovereign, in order to avoid the "war of all against all" that would develop without common law and government to regulate our behavior. John Locke, considered to be the philosophical ancestor of America, argued several years later in 1690 that a fair social contract should hold the government, as well as the citizens, accountable to the broader public standards of preserving life, liberty, and property. If a government ignored these basic principles, then the citizens should have the right to overthrow the government. Writing in France, Jean Jacque Rousseau went even further. He insisted that the only just contract was one which reflected the "general will" of all signatories--their common commitment to standards of public virtue that would govern the community. Each year the citizens would have to meet to reaffirm their commitment to this contract or to change it. On questions of basic law, Rousseau said, there could be no surrendering representation to secondary institutions.

Today, laws passed by local and national governments are presumed to provide the social contract for our communities. Obviously, this proposition is honored more in theory than in fact. Were our society to obey the law, there would be few murders, robberies, instances of vandalism, corporate rip-offs, and political corruption. Modern America faces all of these problems, however, despite an abundance of laws to deal with them.

The problem is particularly acute in low-income and minority communities, in view of the uneven application of different laws to different groups. When laws governing racial discrimination are loosely enforced, it is hardly surprising that minority young people develop cynical attitudes about the government that makes them. When middle and upper-class young people receive mild sentences for vandalism in the suburbs, while their low-income counterparts in the inner city are treated severely--or at least expected to be by the public--it is not surprising that urban young people end up viewing police, the courts, and the law itself as the enemy. Unfortunately, it is not judges who suffer the consequences of a disrespect for law, it is the neighborhoods themselves. For these communities, the results are catastrophic, as much for the vandals as for their victims.

Therefore, given that the laws of society have lost their force in many neighborhoods, perhaps it is time for the people of these neighborhoods to heed Rousseau's advice and develop social contracts of their own. Such a process would have seemed almost inevitable to early Americans. To them, in a country this large, law made sense only when enforced in a small community of a few citizens, assumed to be equal in influence and dignity--citizens who shared through continuing discussion a sense of what their community required. Under these conditions, social pressure would be as effective in enforcing common standards as the courts. Without this strong social support, moreover, early Americans realized that the laws would appear foreign and tyrannical, regardless of the process for choosing legislators. They knew, in short, that respect for law depends upon consent, and that consent often depends upon the opportunity to affirm, actively, whatever the precise agreement is to be.

C. Social Contract Technique

Designing a neighborhood social contract is like setting up a code of rules or law. Let's say, for example, that the leaders of a community want to establish a social contract for neighborhood security. Their normal response to neighborhood crime would be to call a meeting where residents would air their complaints. Then someone would outline a few techniques for self-protection--watching one another's homes, patrolling blocks, etc. Someone else would call for a follow-up meeting with the police. Then the leaders would pass around a sign-up sheet for volunteers to work on future programs and everyone would go home.

What sort of common purpose would this meeting develop, however? While a few people would sound off, the rest would remain quiet. Nor would anyone know what the other neighbors thought about the problem. Security affects everyone, not just the people who come to meetings. Without some visible commitment from the entire community to enforce standards of protection, no one would feel genuinely safe.

This is where the social contract technique could make a difference. Instead of asking, "What are your complaints?" the chairperson would start by asking, "What rules should we make governing security in this neighborhood?" The discussion, then, would aim at developing a list of acceptable community standards. It would not matter that some rules merely

repeated existing laws. The important point is that the neighbors themselves would agree to enforce the rules, or to demand their enforcement by existing authorities. Moreover, they would express this agreement not merely by voting for the contract, but by signing it. That is the point of a contract: people sign it. They also seek the signatures of everyone in the neighborhood. When they have canvassed their blocks for signatures, they recopy the contract with all the signatures and distribute it to everyone. From that point forward, people who complained about problems of security would refer not merely to laws, but to the specific rules that the community had endorsed. Then the neighborhood association could work to prevent continuing violations of the rules.

The advantages of social contracts should be obvious, but we will list a few of the most important ones.

First, contracts force neighbors to think about the positive values hidden behind their complaints. Listing only what's wrong with a community discourages people, unless they feel that they can do something to improve it. Thinking specifically about what the neighborhood ought to be gives people hope that improvement is possible.

Second, contracts show the majority of the neighbors that they do share certain standards for their neighborhood. Often, neighbors feel like they are the only ones who are concerned about a particular problem or issue. A social contract, signed by all the people around them, tells everyone that they are not alone--that they can turn to their neighbors for assistance. The process is critical to building community.

Third, contracts offer potential violators a gentle warning to change their ways before the neighbors single them out. Usually, residents know when they are doing something considered unacceptable. They may even feel that a particular rule is "aimed at them." Yet this is a healthy feeling. It shows that they are aware of their behavior. The contract, signed by their neighbors, tells them to shape up without pointing directly at them.

Fourth, contracts tell institutions external to the neighborhood what the standards of the community are. Police officers who know that neighbors have signed a security contract will have a clear understanding of how they feel about crime and harassment. Real estate agents and landlords ought to receive all social contracts covering issues like noise, pets, and curfews, so that they can make potential homebuyers and

tenants aware of them. Moreover, as we shall see, the contract technique is a good way to negotiate agreements between residents and institutions--banks, businesses, even public officials. If a community doesn't always have the power to pass a law, it might at least be able to force a specific private or public agency to endorse a contract. Signed agreements of this kind can help define what society means by phrases like "corporate" or "public responsibility."

Finally, contracts clarify the strength of the community itself. Obviously, a list of rules, even one signed by everyone, is no better than the willingness of the neighbors to enforce them. An agreement with an institution, likewise, will make sense only if both sides live up to it. Some community organizations show their strength by the number of victories they can win against the establishment. Others measure it by the number of programs they sponsor. The contract technique establishes the most compelling, but fairest, standard of all--the ability of an organization to reflect and enforce the best values of those whom it pretends to represent.

In many of these sessions, we will ask participants to imagine what model social contracts for their neighborhoods would look like. In a few cases, we will reproduce contracts already in use in different communities. We expect that a few community leaders will not wait for the end of the course to apply the technique; they will get started right away. In the first seminar conducted by the Institute using the technique, this is exactly what happened. There are now several blocks in Philadelphia using social contracts. Soon, we expect many more. It is a simple technique, but an important one. As this entire course argues, community emerges when people discover what they share. A social contract affirms this discovery in a language that everyone can understand.

D. Breakdown of Sessions

Session 1. Preconditions of Community

In this session, students will be asked to define what they mean by a "community," then whether they feel that their neighborhoods constitute active communities. They will be asked to familiarize themselves with the preconditions of community to be explored in the course--security, reciprocity, fellowship, and justice. To what extent do established institutions promote each of these values in neighborhoods? To what extent would an active community organization be required to promote these values?

Readings:

"Observations on Community," John Schaar
"The Uses of City Neighborhoods," from The Life and Death of American Cities, Jane Jacobs, in "The City as a Community," Edited by Gerald Lilenward, pp. 111-120.

Session 2. The Value of Security

This session will examine problems of security within the neighborhoods. Are there issues of security in the neighborhoods? What are they? How are police, school, social service, and community institutions responding to them? Do residents define security merely as freedom from crime, or do groups of young people on street corners constitute threats to security as well? What would a secure neighborhood look like?

Readings:

"Crime Patterns in Philadelphia: 1840-1870," by David R. Johnson, in The Peoples of Philadelphia, Allan Davis & Mark Haller, pp. 89-107.

Session 3. The Value of Reciprocity

Reciprocity is the value of fairness in dealings between citizens. A sense of reciprocity is critical to relationships within the neighborhoods. Do residents of a neighborhood make equivalent contributions to its well-being, or do some do "all the work," while others contribute nothing to the quality of life? Is there a balance between the claims of different groups within the neighborhood-residents, developers, industrial plants, stores--or do some groups get special treatment? What, then, are the issues of reciprocity within the neighborhood to which a community association might respond?

Readings:

"Industrial Metropolis as Inheritance," The Private City, Sam Bass Warner, Jr., pp. 202-210.

The Urban Neighborhood, excerpts, Suzanne Langer, pp. 1-36.

"How Americans Combat Individualism by the Principle of Self-Interest, Rightly Understood," Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Volume II, Book II, Chapter 8.

Session 4. The Value of Fellowship

To what extent does the neighborhood promote friendships among residents? Around what institutions do friendship patterns develop? Or is the neighborhood merely a geographic center for isolated people? Are the blocks organized? Should a community association attempt to promote fellowship in the

neighborhood, or would most residents prefer to be left to themselves?

Readings:

"Spirit of Township in New England," Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Volume I, Chapter 5.

"The Ghetto as a Cultural Community," (Jewish) from The Ghetto, Lewis Wirth, pp. 201-226.

"Portrait of a Changing Irish Neighborhood," from That Most Distressful Nation, Andrew M. Greeley, pp. 231-245.

"Bronzeville," from Black Metropolis, St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Volume II, pp. 383-397.

Session 5. The Ideal of Justice

Two distinct ideas of justice survive in America, reflecting the complex influences on our national values and goals. The dominant idea evolves from our liberal heritage as a free society that guarantees equality of opportunity to achieve private advantages of wealth and security. Within this tradition, government is obliged to protect the property of each person, to guarantee equality of opportunity of all groups to the rewards that society offers and to insure equality in voting and democratic institutions.

A second, more idealistic tradition, stemming from our religious traditions, has had a profound impact on America as well. In this tradition, justice is achieved only when all people work together to bring out the best qualities of each one. In Plato's formulation, the just community is one in which there is a "right ordering" of the spiritual, military, and economic needs of the community; and in which each person is making precisely the best contribution that he or she is suited to make. Most successful movements for economic justice in America have been based on something approaching this conception of justice.

As de Tocqueville argued, few Americans will state baldly that they have a right to do as they please, regardless of what happens around them. Most debates within society, and by extension within neighborhoods, reflect conflicts between the liberal and the idealistic conceptions of justice. Unfortunately, the warriors in these battles often never reach the point of sorting out the issues of principle that divide them. Instead, they attack one another racially or ethnically, or move away.

This session will engage students in a discussion of their own conception of justice and how it affects their view of a number of important community problems.

Readings:

The Model of Christian Charity, by John Winthrop.

"Wealth, by Andrew Carnegie," in Democracy and The Gospel of Wealth, Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Company, 1949.

Andrew Jackson's Veto of the Second National Bank, July 10, 1832.

Session 6. Justice and Security

What would be a just strategy for a neighborhood association to adopt in dealing with issues of security--a strategy that only emphasized separating vandals and criminals from the community; a strategy that emphasized protecting the neighborhood from crime; or a strategy that worked on rehabilitating ex-offenders as well? This debate will be related to the principles of justice examined in the previous session.

Readings:

"The Future of the Lower Class," from The Unheavenly City, Edward Banfield, pp. 236-256.

John Maher of Delancey St., Grover Sales, excerpts, pp. 53-55; 59-61; 62-67; 92-93; 95-97; 157-161.

Session 7. Justice and Reciprocity

What is a just strategy for establishing reciprocity in dealings among neighborhood residents? Would the community association win support for a code of ethics in the neighborhood? To what extent will businesses and banks take the quality of neighborhood life into consideration in their investment and development decisions in the neighborhood? How can government deal fairly with neighborhoods in its own planning and development decisions? This, too, will be related to standards of justice explored in Session 5.

Readings:

William Raspberry, "Making Johnny Learn," Washington Post, January 30, 1976.

Robert Creamer, "Organizing Money," Public Policy Reader, Derek Shearer and Lee Webb, eds., Washington, Institute for Policy Studies, 1975.

Bill Callahan, "Fair Taxation with Real Representation," published by Tax Equity for America Party, Philadelphia.

Session 8. Justice and Fellowship

What kind of organization is best suited to promote fellowship around the pursuit of justice in neighborhoods--a cooperative, self-development organization that pools neighborhood resources to solve problems; a direct action organization that aims at winning victories from political and economic institutions; or the ward structure within the political parties? This session will explore the strengths and weaknesses of each strategy, consistant with the discussion of community and justice undertaken throughout the seminar.

Readings:

Cooperative Community Development, excerpts, Edited by Joe Falk, pp. 47-65.

"Conflict Tactics," from Reveille for Radicals, Saul Alinsky, pp. 132-146.

"How to Become a Statesman,"; "To Hold Your District: Study Human Nature and Act Accordin'"; "On Municipal Ownership"; "Tammany's Patriotism"; and "The Strenuous Life of the District Leader," from Plunkitt of Tammany Hall, William L. Riordan.

UNIT I. THE PRECONDITIONS OF COMMUNITY

A. Introduction

The word "community" is used in so many ways these days that it is difficult to understand what people mean by it. Residents of relatively small towns, for example, will refer to "our community," implying that they share something more than the land on which their homes are located. At the same time, we hear references to the "black community" or the "Italian community," assuming an identity of purpose within a racial or ethnic minority that extends throughout the country. Activists in urban neighborhoods talk about creating a "sense of community" among the people who live there, without ever saying how they will create this mysterious feeling of belonging. Finally, we hear the term "community of interest" used to describe an alliance between two groups that disagree on fundamental questions, but are willing to work together around a specific issue upon which they agree, even for different reasons.

We, therefore, will establish our own definition of community, the one upon which this text is based, from the beginning. It is a tough definition. We believe that a community is a group of people working together actively to achieve a common goal. Or, in St. Augustine's classic formulation, "a community is a group of people united around the common object of their love." (1.) The notion of unity is critical to this definition. The idea that people work together is central to it. The idea that they accept the authority of the group over their behavior--that is, once the group decides, they go along--is critical. Without these conditions, we believe there is no community, even if the people involved might share a common space, a common race, or even a common ethnic nationality and citizenship.

The tough definition of community allows us to identify degrees of community among people. A group of people may share the common goal of building a house. They are willing to work together to build the house. They are willing to accept the authority of the group over their house-building decisions. Yet that is the extent of the community that binds them. They would not accept the authority of the group over their vacation plans, or agree to work together to sponsor a picnic. Moreover, once the house is built, their community ceases. This is a community, as far as it goes, but its members and those who observe it must understand how far it does go. Often, community activists show great enthusiasm when they mobilize people's work together around

a specific issue or cause, only to become disgusted when the group disbands after the issue is won or lost. They have failed to identify the extent to which the group shared an objective.

This tough definition of community also allows us to identify different kinds of communities. As St. Augustine himself argued, the "common objects" of people's love may vary considerably. There are communities devoted to farming, to war, and communities organized to pursue a spiritual ideal. The partners in a law firm may constitute a community of law practice, just as the active members of a union share a community devoted to gaining decent wages, hours, and working conditions for their members. Community, then, may be a value, but it is not an ultimate value. Nazis had a community with one another--based upon their common love of war, conquest, and genocide. The early Puritans in the United States shared a quite different kind of community, devoted to the pursuit of God's will as revealed in Scripture and interpreted by their Ministers. Thus, our assessment of the moral character of a community will depend upon our assessment of its common objectives. As Puritan preachers themselves put it, "The mind is great if the object of its desire is great: 'as the things and objects are great or mean, that men converse withall; so they are high or low spirited.'"

Around what kind of goals, then, do people form active communities? Borrowing from Aristotle, Professor John Schaar of the University of California at Santa Cruz identifies four:

> mutual protection and material convenience, "because through the interplay of the diversities, men were able to serve as compliments of one another and to attain a higher and better life by the mutual exchange of different services";
>
> reciprocity, the "feeling of mutuality and fairness" that must characterize the economic relationships among people;
>
> fellowship, sympathy, and good will, "tying the members of the community together; and
>
> justice. "It is the capstone. It is found perfectly in the formulation that men form communities not just to live, but to live a life of felicity and goodness." (2.)

Professor Schaar is particularly insistent upon the importance of developing a common sense of justice in communities that hope to last. Aristotle, he points out, believed that without this sense, "sociability and fellowship becomes mere herding together undistinguished by any nobler purpose of gain, and the community itself becomes little more than a commercial enterprise." Professor

Schaar tells us that Plato's standards for community were even harsher than Aristotle's. Schaar notes that to Plato, "'political community' was possible only under a couple of prior conditions--where, first of all, men are bound by a common reverence for the same conception of justice and of virtue. Secondly, these tablets of justice and virtue must be based in divine origin, must be hallowed by tradition, and must be enforced by the laws and institutions." (3.)

These are important statements. We should examine how Professor Schaar develops them.

"OBSERVATIONS ON COMMUNITY"

John Schaar
May 1970

(Editor's Note: Between September, 1969 and May, 1970 – at the behest of the Editor – the American office of the International Association of Cultural Freedom in Cambridge, Mass. conducted six sessions on the idea of "community". The sessions were a prototype of the kind of programs that the Institute for the Study of Civic Values now sponsors in Philadelphia. Scholars, labor leaders, activists met monthly with Professors John Schaar, Wilson Carey McWilliams, and others to examine how their theories of "community" applied to the political, economic, and social crises of America today. Transcripts of the proceedings, then, were made available to the participants. The papers developed by Professors Schaar and McWilliams for these seminars were never published. The Institute has used them effectively; however, particularly in seminars with professionals involved in community work. Indeed, the Institute's Neighborhoods Project, aimed at promoting urban neighborhoods as centers of community in the cities, evolved out a study group examining the concept of "community" presented here.

I, of course, don't know where you people have been, what kind of journeys you've had, but I thought at least I'd try to start – I know your general theme has been community – by saying a very few, very basic, almost elementary words about some of the ways that notion, that problem, that set of ideas and theories have been formulated in the tradition of Western political thought and institutions. Maybe they'll set a kind of context, a kind of boundary, provide us with a few terms when we try to talk about where we are. So this is going to be very schematic, it's even going to be stark – a kind of schematic presentation of some of the basic ways of this oldest and in our day again, liveliest of the problems of political theory. I'm not going to try to say anyting new. I'm just going to try to formulate a few themes for our talk.

I think the way the question has been mainly formulated (and it's a formulation that's appearing among us again today) is one that starts with a tension or strain between the demands of political order and structure and uniformity on the other. Today, in place after place, in writer after writer, this theme and this problem in effect is being formulated in ways that make it insoluable, that offer terms for the discussion which can end up only in paradox. It's formulated today increasingly as not merely a tension, but probably an incompatibility, between things that we call individual freedom or authenticity or self-fulfillment and self-realization on the one side, and the structures and processes of power and of domination and of alienation and mediation on the other.

Even that harsh formulation, and in the end not very useful formulation, is not new. If you start, for example, with certain of the themes in that magnificent Platonic allegory of the Cave, we're already taught that at least for certain individuals who would seek the highest possible fulfillment of their potential, it is necessary to leave the market place – to leave the life of common men and of common things, and to fix their gaze and their energies on an order of truth and reality and being which is higher, more enduring than the fleeting images of the world of opinion. And Plato tells us that once a man has tasted of that, he in effect will have to be compelled to descend again into the cave, into the market place, to shoulder some of the common burdens of ruling and of caring for the whole.

That flight, that Platonic flight from the market place – in his argument, of course, in the interest of the highest possibilities of the self, and only for the best men – is recommended today by moderns for all men. The notion of higher and of lower has virtually disappeared from the recommendation. So you can see the symbolical structure of the argument is as old as Plato, but the content and the tenor of the argument is, I think, among us today very, very different. You cut off the notion of higher and

lower and the whole thing changes. The modern consciousness contains very little of that Platonic notion that when the prepared man leaves the market place he will find authentic fulfillment not in an order created by him, but in an order discovered by him – real and existing outside of himself. Whereas for the modern, increasingly we are being told by the writers on this subject that man's only authentic and true home is the self itself. That is the only home he has, and that of course is a decisive difference. That's one way the problem has been formulated for us, that's one way of stating very starkly the change of accent that has taken place in formulating the argument.

And then there is a contending formulation of the question which is like the other one, equally old and equally new. This contending formulation, of course, found its earliest philosophical treatment in the Aristotelian vision of political life, a vision that tried to reconcile the difference between the private and the public selves – which argues that participation in the public things and cares was an essential activity in the individual quest for fulfillment or authenticity that the idiot, in effect, was not fully a man. Now that formulation finds its modern echoes, of course, in such things as the slogans of participatory democracy and in a good many books and essays. But here again there are decisive differences between the classical and modern formulations on this question which I'm going to touch on in just a minute. So then we have this one way of formulating the question – it's a formulation that asks, "can the individual participate in the structures and processes of politics and still achieve an authentic expression of the highest potentialities of the self?" We have that one common way of formulating the question and we already have those two great and opposing answers to it.

There has been, I think, a second enduring way of formulating this problem and question in political philosophy. The question is put, "Are there any conditons which are prior to and necessary for the existence of political order and community, as such? Are there then indispensable prerequisites for political community?" Here again, I want to look very, very quickly at some of the contending answers to that question. One starts again with Plato, because he has offered us an enduring answer to the question – one that still echoes in muted form and sometimes in very loud voices among us today. Usually, I suppose, if you were doing this very seriously from Plato, you would look at *The Republic*. I want to just simply instead go through the retelling of a little story in *The Protagoras*, where Plato offers us one of his earliest myths. That is, of course, his telling of the myth of Prometheus.

I won't try to expound the dialogue or anything of that sort, just retell the story very quickly. You remember it runs something like – after the creatures were created by the gods they gave to Epimetheus and to Prometheus the work of equipping each of the creatures with the materials and ability necessary to their survival. Again, as I'm sure you know, it was Epimetheus who took on the job and he loused it up. By the time he got around to man, the highest creature, he had exhausted all the materials and resources available to him. His brother Prometheus coped with the problem by that famous theft – he stole the mechanical arts and fire. He could not, however – we are told in this Platonic telling of the myth, steal political wisdom because that was held by Zeus.

Now fascinatingly, at this very early time, we're told that man is already equipped for survival. He is able to live dispersed with the arts that have been made available to him by this theft. He is able to live without the city in small and scattered and isolated groups. In this condition, then, men have the means of light, but they are too weak to defend themselves against some of the animals more furiously equipped. For, we are told by Plato, they lack the art of government, of which the art of war is a part. Therefore, they gathered into cities for their self-preservation, but lacking that art of government, they fell into conflict. Zeus, fearing the extermination of the whole race, sent his messenger to them, and here I quote: "bearing reverence and justice to be the ordering principles of cities and the bonds of friendship and conciliation." Then three other things are brought along at the same time. There is the instruction that reverence and justice must be distributed so that each man shares in them. They must not be distributed in the way the arts are, where only some can have an art and not all, for we're told that cities can exist only if all men share in the virtues and in a reverence for justice. The next thing that is brought is a God-decreed law declaring that he who has no part in reverence and justice shall be put to death as a plague of the state. The final counsel is that the state must vigorously and constantly, through every means available to it, teach men laws and teach men the meaning of justice. It must compel all men to live after the pattern furnished by the laws and justice and not to live after their own fancies and tastes.

The point is, I think, in his way of formulating the question, political community is possible only under a couple of prior conditions – where, first of all, men are bound together by a common reverence for the same conception of justice and of virtue. Secondly, these tablets of justice and of virtue must be based in divine origin, must be hallowed by tradition, and must be enforced by the laws and the institutions. Now that is such a beautiful and still timely way of making that formulation. It is as though in anticipation, Plato had looked forward to that time which is ours, when, in effect, God is dead, when tradition is either hollow, (or for those who still have it, it is seen mainly as a burden); where the law is seen increasingly as little more than temporary treaties in the struggle of competing groups for competitive advantage; and finally, where sets of beliefs held in common are said to be something called ideologies, all of which might be equally valid. Or at least, we are very confused about the status of our loyalities and our obligations to any such sets of seemingly arbitrary and relative beliefs. In short, then, we live in a world obviously without tradition and transcendence, and I'm simply trying to remind you that theorists heretofore, very powerful ones among them, have known of no way of keeping order in such a time save through force.

Now that myth and most politicial thought stemming from that time always formulated the question in terms of what did man owe the city and each other. What is so fascinating and troublesome in our time is that today, the very priorities ordinarily in most of the discussions of this subject and in most of the books on this subject have shifted so that the

primary concern is not so much with what men owe the city as it is with what each man owes himself. That is where I think typically, discussions even of this theme and topic tend to begin today. It comes as no surprise. In many ways this was the American concern, the American promise, the American commitment from the very foundling. Our central value was liberty, it was not common reverence for justice and for virtue. Liberty was defined as private liberty, namely as the liberty to enhance one's private estate and possibilities to the limits of his power. Interests and desires become the main if not the sole guides to conduct. In that profound sense, the American foundling was genuinely democratic. By calling it genuinely democratic, I mean there were to be imposed no common standards. I mean, secondly, that the test of conduct was held to be self-interest or self-expression or self-fulfillment. The context would vary. The logic would be remarkably uniform. Thirdly, I mean that all desires were to be regarded as equally valid. Desire is to be gratified in effect because it is there. I'm trying to say that it is that tendency which has now reached its perfection among us.

It's that tendency that sets, I think, the problem for our discussion. A hundred texts and movements today, even those that think they are talking about political community, stress self-liberation and self-fulfillment. They reject, in one of the common vocabularies of the day, "role-playing". Or they reject singleness of occupation and purpose. We're, I think, striving for some vulgarized version of the Marxian vision of the multiple man set forth in *The German Ideology*.

Many writers today are stressing, in effect that any institution which is not immediately responsive to personal desire and demands is without justification. That's where most of the writers are. The test of the validity of any institution is that it must directly and almost immediately contribute to the fulfillment of personal demand and desire. Of course, there's an interesting body of writers – I think they've got their own problems but they're interesting – Abraham Maslow's perhaps the most powerful of them, who try to go beyond this and provide a task. Institutions must fill basic human needs, not merely all interests and desires. The problem, however, is that the list of those basic human needs varies among the writers.

I just want to conclude by saying that nobody can say at all where this modern discovery and celebration of the self is going to lead us. I want to make a couple of points about it. First of all, nobody known to me has found that kind of integrative principle of the self upon which we can build towards all those shining and dazzling promises that are held before us today, such as authenticity, the experimental and open orientation, and so forth. I'm trying to say that it is so important to understand that after 300 years of looking for it, the self remains elusive, ironically perhaps, the most elusive thing of all, though seemingly it is the most intimate thing, the thing closest to us. Now, secondly, if that is the case, and if these impulses towards self realization are basic, then the only justification for political order and community is that they must aid in achieving self-fulfillment. That formulation I've just proposed to you probably renders the whole problem of political community odious. It probably makes it impossible to discuss the problem meaningfully. It rests, as I've said, on a very vague basis – the elusive self. Then it goes on to rest all its supreme values on the self. By doing so, I think it virtually forecloses most of the really serious questions that have to be encountered in a discussion of the problem of community.

I'll close on just one point. Just to suggest what some of the problems which are to be encountered in a serious discussion of community, I want to suggest to you a few offered by Aristotle. You remember he had a magnificent arguemnt with Plato on exactly this question. It remains, I think, the very best discussion of the matter in the whole of Western political thought. He took up the contest with Plato at exactly that point where Plato had concluded after a pwerful and beautiful argument that since unity was a good in the state the best state was the one with the most unity and the state was a perfect unity. It was exactly at that point that Aristotle enters the conversation with the proposition that the state cannot attain, and therefore should not aspire to attain unity. He thought this was so because the state consists neither of one man nor of a body of identicals. Rather it consists of a body of different kinds of men. Therefore, he tells us, community requires different kinds of capacity, interest and character among its members. It does so because through the interplay of the diversities, men, are able to serve as compliments of one another and to attain a higher and better life by the mutual exchange of different services. That's the first area of discussion for the problem of community.

That something more that I'm trying to deal with, I think, has two parts. It first of all has a part going by a number of names – fellowship, sympathy and good will tying the members of the body together, giving them a sense of common trust and responsibility. Aristotle tries to argue that this feeling must characterize the social bond just as the spirit of utility and fairness must characterize the economic bond. The fourth and final element in this presentation of the problem of community is simply justice. It is the capstone. It is found perfectly in the formulation that men form communities not just to live, but to live a life of felicity and goodness. Aristotle tries to tell us that this is what must characterize the political bond, namely the pursuit of justice and goodness, and that without this capstone all the rest is defective – sociability and fellowship become mere herding together undistinguished by any nobler purpose of gain, and the community itself becomes little more than a commercial enterprise.

In short, I'm trying to suggest that, if we really want to think seriously about the theory and the problem of community, we think of four sectors of the problem as mutual protection and material convenience. Secondly, the area of reciprocity; thirdly, fellowship and sociability; and fourthly, the agreement on felicity and justice. As nearly as I have been able to read, most of the modern formulations which start from the self will help us to talk usefully about no one of those four.

C. Community and Neighborhoods

From these arguments, activists should recognize the importance of understanding the values and goals of the people in their own neighborhoods. It would be difficult to mobilize people to fight for neighborhood security, for example, if they felt secure. It would be impossible to build an organization devoted to improving social contacts in the neighborhood if churches and civic organizations already planned regular social events; or, alternatively, if the neighbors weren't interested in relating to one another socially. These are the kind of questions that an activist must ask about a neighborhood before even determining what kind of community organization is possible within it. What common traditions and values do they share, and what do they not share? To what extent would the neighborhood identify common problems of security, reciprocity, and fellowship, to which an organization would have to respond? Obviously, the broadest common goal of all-pursuing justice-is available to neighborhoods at all times, since the world as it is presents us with injustices galore. Yet to build this kind of idealistic organization, the neighborhood residents already must believe that working for justice is important, or the organizer must persuade them that it is. As the reader is doubtless aware, this is no easy task.

Ms. Jane Jacobs, author of The Death and Life of American Cities, suggests a few of the major problems.

The Uses of City Neighborhoods
by Jane Jacobs (5.)

> Neighborhood is a word that has come to sound like a Valentine. As a sentimental concept, "neighborhood" is harmful to city planning. It leads to attempts at warping city life into imitations of town or suburban life. Sentimentality plays with sweet intentions in place of good sense.
>
> A successful city neighborhood is a place that keeps sufficiently abreast of its problems so it is not destroyed by them. An unsuccessful neighborhood is a place that is overwhelmed by its defects and problems and is progressively more helpless before them. Our cities contain all degrees of success and failure. But on the whole we Americans are poor at handling city neighborhoods, as can be seen by the long accumulations of failures in our great grey belts on the one hand, and by the Turfs of rebuilt city on the other hand.
>
> It is fashionable to suppose that certain touchstones of the good life will create good neighborhoods-schools, parks, clean housing and the like. How easy life would be if this were so! How charming to control a complicated and ornery society by bestowing upon it rather simply physical goodies. In real life, cause and effect

are not so simple. Thus a Pittsburgh study, undertaken to show the supposed clear correlation between better housing and improved social conditions, compared delinquency records in still uncleared slums to delinquency records in new housing projects, and came to the embarrassing discovery that the delinquency was higher in the improved housing. Does this mean improved shelter increases delinquency? Not at all. It means other things may be more important than housing, however, and it means also that there is no direct, simple relationship between good housing and good behavior, a fact which the whole tale of the Western world's history, the whole collection of our literature, and the whole fund of observation open to any of us should long since have made evident. Good shelter is a useful good in itself, as shelter. When we try to justify good shelter instead on the pretentious grounds that it will work social or family miracles we fool ourselves. Reinhold Niebuhr has called this particular self-deception "the doctrine of salvation by bricks."

It is even the same with schools. Important as good schools are, they prove totally undependable at rescuing bad neighborhoods and at creating good neighborhoods. Nor does a good school building guarantee a good education. Schools, like parks, are apt to be volatile creatures of their neighborhoods (as well as being creatures of larger policy). In bad neighborhoods, schools are brought to ruination, physically and socially; while successful neighborhoods improve their schools by fighting for them.*

Nor can we conclude, either, that middle-class families or upper-class families build good neighborhoods, and poor families fail to. For example, within the poverty of the North End in Boston, within the poverty of the West Greenwich Village waterfront neighborhoods, within the poverty of the slaughterhouse district in Chicago (three areas, incidentally, that were all written off as hopeless by their cities' planners), good neighborhoods were created: neighborhoods whose internal problems have grown less with time instead of greater. Meantime, within the once upper-class grace and serenity of Baltimore's beautiful Eutaw Place, within the one-time upper-class solidity of Boston's South End, within the culturally privileged purlieus of New York's Morningside Heights, within miles upon miles of dull, respectable middle-class gray area, bad neighborhoods were created, neighborhoods whose apathy and internal failure grew greater with time instead of less.

**In the Upper West Side of Manhattan, a badly failed area where social disintegration has been compounded by ruthless bulldozing, project building and shoving people around, annual pupil turnover in schools was more than 50% in 1959-60. In 16 schools, it reached an average of 92%. It is ludicrous to think that with any amount of effort, official or unofficial, even a tolerable school is possible in a neighborhood of such extreme instability. Good schools are impossible in any unstable neighborhood with high pupil turnover rates, and this includes unstable neighborhoods with good housing.*

To hunt for city neighborhood touchstones of success in high standards of physical facilities, or in supposedly competent nonproblem populations, or in nostalgic memories of town life is a waste of time. It evades the meat of the question, which is the problem of what city neighborhoods do, if anything, that may be socially and economically useful in cities themselves, and how they do it.

We shall have something solid to chew on if we think of city neighborhoods as mundane organs of self-government. Our failures with city neighborhoods are, ultimately, failures in localized self-government. And our successes are successes at localized self-government. I am using self-government in its broadest sense, meaning both the informal and formal self-management of society.

Both the demands on self-government and the techniques for it differ in big cities from the demands and techniques in smaller places. For instance, there is the problem of all those strangers. To think of city neighborhoods as organs of city self-government or self-management, we must first jettison some orthodox but irrelevant notions about neighborhoods which may apply to communities in smaller settlements but not in cities. We must first of all drop any ideal of neighborhoods as self-contained or introverted units.

Unfortunately orthodox planning theory is deeply committed to the ideal of supposedly cozy, inward-turned city neighborhoods. In its pure form, the ideal is a neighborhood composed of 7,000 persons, a unit supposedly of sufficient size to populate an elementary school and to support convenience shopping and a community center. This unit is then further rationalized into smaller groupings of a size scaled to the play and supposed management of children and the chitchat of housewives. Although the "ideal" is seldom literally reproduced it is the point of departure for nearly all neighborhood renewal plans, for all project building, for much modern zoning, and also for practice work done by today's architectural-planning students, who will be inflicting their adaptations of it on cities tomorrow. In New York City alone, by 1959, more than half a million people were already living in adaptations of this vision of planned neighborhoods. This "ideal" of the city neighborhood as an island, turned inward on itself, is an important factor in our lives nowadays.

To see why it is a silly and even harmful "ideal" for cities, we must recognize a basic difference between these concoctions grafted into cities, and town life. In a town of 5,000 or 10,000 population, if you go to Main Street (analogous to the consolidated commercial facilities or community center for a planned neighborhood), you run into people you also know at

work, or went to school with, or see at church, or people who are your children's teachers, or who have sold or given you professional or artisan's services, or whom you know to be friends of your casual acquaintances, or whom you know by reputation. Within the limits of a town or village, the connections among its people keep crossing and recrossing and this can make workable and essentially cohesive communities out of even larger towns than those of 7,000 population, and to some extent out of little cities.

But a population of 5,000 or 10,000 residents in a big city has no such innate degree of natural cross-connections within itself, except under the most extraordinary circumstances. Nor can city neighborhood planning, no matter how cozy in intent, change this fact. If it could, the price would be destruction of a city by converting it into a parcel of towns. As it is, the price of trying, and not even succeeding at a misguided aim, is conversion of a city into a parcel of mutually suspicious and hostile Turfs. There are many other flaws in this "ideal" of the planned neighborhood and its various adaptations.*

Lately a few planners, notably Reginald Isaacs of Harvard, have daringly begun to question whether the conception of neighborhood in big cities has any meaning at all. Isaacs points out that city people are mobile. They can and do pick and choose from the entire city (and beyond) for everything from a job, a dentist, recreation or friends, to shops, entertainment, or even in some cases their children's schools. City people, says Isaacs, are not stuck with the provincialism of a neighborhood, and why should they be? Isn't wide choice and rich opportunity the point of cities?

**Even the old reason for settling on an ideal population of about 7,000-sufficient to populate an elementary school-is silly the moment it is applied to big cities, as we discover if we merely ask the question: Which school? In many American cities, parochial-school enrollment rivals or surpasses public-school enrollment. Does this mean there should be two schools as presumed neighborhood glue, and the population should be twice as large? Or is the population right, and should the schools be half as large? And why the elementary school? If school is to be the touchstone of scale, why not the junior high school, an institution typically far more troublesome in our cities than the elementary school? The question "Which school?" is never asked because this vision is based on no more realism about schools than about anything else. The school is a plausible, and usually abstract, excuse for defining some size for a unit that comes out of dreams about imaginary cities. It is necessary as a formal framework, to preserve designers from intellectual chaos, and it has no other reason for being. Ebenezer Howard's model towns are ancestors of the idea, to be sure, but its durability comes from the need to fill an intellectual vacuum.*

This is indeed the point of cities. Furthermore, this very fluidity of use and choice among city people is precisely the foundation underlying most city cultural activities and special enterprises of all kinds. Because these can draw skills, materials, customers or clienteles from a great pool, they can exist in extraordinary variety, and not only downtown but in other city districts that develop specialties and characters of their own. And in drawing upon the great pool of the city in this way, city enterprises increase, in turn, the choices available to city people for jobs, goods, entertainment, ideas, contacts, services.

Whatever city neighborhoods may be, or may not be, and whatever usefulness they may have, or may be coaxed into having, their qualities cannot work at cross-purposes to thoroughgoing city mobility and fluidity of use, without economically weakening the city of which they are a part. The lack of either economic or social self-containment is natural and necessary to city neighborhoods-simply because they are parts of cities. Isaacs is right when he implies that the conception of neighborhood in cities is meaningless-so long as we think of neighborhoods as being self-contained units to any significant degree, modeled upon town neighborhoods.

But for all the innate extroversion of city neighborhoods, it fails to follow that city people can therefore get along magically without neighborhoods. Even the most urbane citizen does care about the atmosphere of the street and district where he lives, no matter how much choice he has of pursuits outside it, and the common run of city people do depend greatly on their neighborhoods for the kind of everyday lives they lead.

Let us assume (as is often the case) that city neighbors have nothing more fundamental in common with each other than they share a fragment of geography. Even so, if they fail at managing that fragment decently, the fragment will fail. There exists no inconceivably energetic and all-wise "They" to take over and substitute for localized self-management. Neighborhoods in cities need not supply for their people an artificial town or village life, and to aim at this is both silly and destructive. But neighborhoods in cities do need to supply some means for civilized self-government. This is the problem.

* * * * * * * * *

Here is a seeming paradox: To maintain in a neighborhood sufficient people who stay put, a city must have the very fluidity and mobility of use that Reginald Isaacs noted, as mentioned early in this chapter, when he speculated whether neighborhoods can therefore mean anything very significant to cities.

> Over intervals of time, many people change their jobs and the locations of their jobs, shift or enlarge their outside friendships and interests, change their family sizes, change their incomes up or down, even change many of their tastes. In short they live, rather than just exist. If they live in diversified, rather than monotonous, districts-in districts, particularly, where many details of physical change can constantly be accommodated-and if they like the place, they can stay put despite changes in the locales or natures of their other pursuits or interests. Unlike the people who must move from a lower-middle to a middle-middle to an upper-middle suburb or their incomes and leisure activities change (or be very outrè indeed), or the people of a little town who must move to another town or to a city to find different opportunities, city people need not pull up stakes for such reasons.
>
> A city's collection of opportunities of all kinds, and the fluidity with which these opportunities and choices can be used, is an asset-not a detriment-for encouraging city-neighborhood stability.
>
> However, this asset has to be capitalized upon. It is thrown away where districts are handicapped by sameness and are suitable, therefore, to only a narrow range of incomes, tastes and family circumstances. Neighborhood accommodations for fixed, bodiless, statistical people are accommodations for instability. The people in them, as statistics, may stay the same. But the people in them, as people, do not. Such places are forever way stations...

D. Neighborhood, Community, Society

Despite these issues, why is organizing in neighborhoods important to the overall effort to build community in society? Many activists believe that neighborhood action is a waste of time. There is no guarantee, they point out, that the people within one geographical area will share enough concerns and values to come together in the same organization. They argue that it would be better merely to bring people together around common issues, or around common relationships to the economic system, or around common ethnic or religious loyalties. Besides, they say, the most serious problems facing the country are beyond the capacity of any individual neighborhood to solve. Power at the national, even international level, is necessary.

These are powerful arguments and neighborhood activists should not dismiss them. Obviously, opportunities to create community among citizens are not peculiar to neighborhoods. Unions organize workers in the workplace around the goals that

they share for their work and their economic betterment. Churches do build communities of faith around common conceptions of God and human obligation, communities that transcend neighborhoods and cities. While there may not be one Black or Italian community, there are certainly strong organizations built around common strategies for justice for Blacks and Italians in America. Alternatively, there are many neighborhoods whose diversity, or whose residents' resistance to organization, defies efforts at mobilizing around anything in common, let alone justice.

Yet if the neighborhood is not the only center for building community in America, we believe that it should be considered an important one. Living closely together may not dictate the same values, but it poses common problems for those who share the same space. Neighborhood residents walk the same streets, shop at the same stores, pass by the same houses and parks, and breathe the same air. Their common environment is at least as powerful as the common working environment of workers at the workplace. If a neighborhood is threatened by crime and vandalism, physical decay, pollution, economic exploitation, all of its residents will share these experiences in ways that they do not share experiences with people elsewhere. Common encounters with life are the basis for common activity, and a neighborhood offers its inhabitants more than their fair share.

The neighborhood offers citizens a tangible arena in which to work out their respective visions of justice with one another. Justice becomes a principle to deal with concrete situations rather than abstract problems. This opportunity to work for justice tangibly was critically important to the classic philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, and St. Augustine. Indeed, they all believed that the community of justice was possible only over a small territory, where people would know one another personally. They felt that it was easier to be just to those whom we knew and about whom we could develop personal feelings than in a large nation of strangers. Many analysts today argue that modern communications has somewhat modified the classical theorists' emphasis on size---although the state of justice in modern society is not really much of an argument. Nonetheless, few would deny that all things being equal, it is easier to care about someone at close range, whom we see regularly, than someone we rarely see at all.

The neighborhood provides a setting in which citizens can participate with the feeling that their involvement matters. A variety of studies bear out this aspect of citizen participation. Sydney Verba and Norman Nie, two prominent political scientists, have found that all other things being equal, participation of citizens is greatest in small, autonomous cities between 10,000 and 25,000 people. (6.) While urban neighborhoods are hardly autonomous, such findings suggest that people

will participate the more they feel that their own involvement will contribute concretely to improving their own condition. Professor Mancur Olson makes this point well in The Logic of Collective Action (7.). People will participate at the local level, Olson suggests, because they think that their own involvement is crucial to the result. The larger the group, the less likely any individual will feel that his or her contribution will matter. Therefore, national organizations often must build membership around services --newsletters, private benefits, insurance and credit schemes --to replace the process of building loyalty that can occur only when a person feels that he or she is needed.

The neighborhood, finally, is the center of representation within our political system. We do not elect public officials for any office from the workplace or from our interest group or from our ethnic Group. We elect people from where we live. If the party organization is strong at the local level, the citizens who become involved in party activity will exercise influence over their own elected officials. When party organization decays, as it has in many areas of the country, then only public opinion polls can tell politicians what their constituents are thinking. Obviously, these polls are an imperfect device for telling a Councilman or woman, or a Representative in Congress what the voters think. So the groups that can afford professional lobbyists and organizers end up exercising a disproportionate influence over elected officials, influence that often goes against what the people within a district would want if they knew how to demand it.

Yet effectively used, neighborhood power can bring national results. Representative William Green of Philadelphia was persuaded by several voters in his District that tax reform was important, and that he should take leadership in demanding it. As a result, the Congressman seized the initiative in the fight to end the depletion allowance. To be sure, the Congressman himself had to assume leadership in the effort to lobby for reform of the tax laws, using his position on the Ways and Means Committee and in the Democratic Congressional caucus as a point of leverage with his collegues. Yet without the knowledge that his constituents thought tax reform to be important, the Congressman would have had little reason to spend time on it. In short, in the cities, it is the residents in the neighborhood who must shape the agendas of their elected officials, or they will be determined by powerful interests with no concern for what the people of the neighborhoods want.

These are the concerns then, that will guide our discussion of community and of the neighborhoods in which community

might be built. We are interested in understanding what the problems of the neighborhoods are, what the values of their residents are, and what issues of security, reciprocity, and fellowship might unite them around a common vision of justice. Answering these questions will not spell out exactly how an activist can organize a strong, idealistic neighborhood association. That is the subject of a course in community organization. Answering the questions in this course are preliminary to any effort to organize a community, however, for without an understanding of the goals of a community, no technique or tactic can bring it into being.

Footnotes

1. St. Augustine, The City of God.

2. John Schaar, "Observations on Community," in The Institute Papers, Towards a Recovery of Civic Idealism, Edward Schwartz, Editor, Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 1975, p. 27.

3. Ibid., p. 26.

4. Ibid., pp. 25-27.

5. From Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, (New York, Random House, 1961), pp. 112-117 and 139-140. Reprinted by permission of Random House, Inc.

6. Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, Participation in America.

7. Mancur Olson, The Logic of Collective Action.

E. Questions for Discussion

1. What are the four most important neighborhood problems or issues that a community organization should try to tackle?

2. What would the goals in dealing with each of these problems be?

3. If you were to leaflet every door of your neighborhood about a meeting to deal with each of these problems, how many people do you think would attend each meeting? Which problem would attract the most people; which would be the second; which, third; and which would attract the smallest number?

4. Now sort out the problems in terms of the broad concerns that they represent--security, reciprocity, and fellowship. Do the problems all come under one heading, or do they represent all threee concerns?

5. Looking back at the problems you listed, which value would now seem to be the most important reason for starting a community organization in your neighborhood--security, reciprocity, or fellowship? You can determine this from your assessment of what problems the community would most want to solve.

6. Why would you say the neighborhood is united, or at least more strongly interested in this value?

   --the values of the people in the neighborhood place a high priority on the value in question. Even when some neighborhoods would be satisfied with the situation in relation to this value, our neighbors would feel that the City isn't doing enough.

   --the real conditions of the neighborhood are so bad in relation to this value that we are concerned about it out of necessity. All we would expect is what every citizen has a right to expect, but the system as it is isn't responding.

7. Now think about the composition of your neighborhood, and consider the following questions:

   --What do you consider your neighborhood to be? If you were starting an organization, what would its boundaries be? If you belong to a neighborhood organization now, what are its boundaries? Do you think that the boundaries of the organization make sense? Why or why not?

   --List all of the things that you believe that the people in your neighborhood share--common space, religious beliefs, political affiliations, economic position, etc. What would these common elements mean in terms of common views on neighborhood problems and values?

   --List all the things that you believe might divide the residents of your neighborhood, in terms of religious beliefs, political affiliations, economic position, etc. What would these divisions mean to the ability of the neighborhood to agree on important neighborhood values?

8. Where would the highest level of agreement be in your neighborhood--on questions of security, reciprocity, or fellowship? Or all three? On what points would your neighbors agree in each of these areas?

9. Where would the highest level of disagreement be?

10. Looking over your answers to these questions, do you think that it would be possible to build your organization around the concerns that unite your neighborhoods, even if there are some disagreements, or are the most important neighborhood issues the ones on which there is also greatest disagreement and conflict?

11. Overall, what kind of community do you think can be built in your neighborhood--one devoted to preserving the privacy of individual residents; one devoted to insuring fair economic and social relationships between the residents and residents and institutions; or one devoted to bringing the neighbors together around the broadest range of common activities?

F. For Further Reading

The Idea of Fraternity in America, Wilson C. McWilliams, Berkeley, University of California, 1973.

The Philosophy of Loyalty, Josiah Royce, in The Philosophy of Josiah Royce, Edited by John K. Roth, New York, Appolo Books, 1973.

The City of God, St. Augustine, especially.

Perspectives on the American Community, Edited by Roland L. Warren, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966.

UNIT II. THE VALUE OF SECURITY

A. Crime in the Neighborhood

The widely acknowledged basic value that all communities expect is security, but there are obviously many neighborhoods that don't have it. Crime may be a response to the economic, social, and physical deterioration of neighborhoods, but it is a response that further contributes to the community's problems. "Predatory crime," James Q. Wilson observes in Thinking About Crime, "does not merely victimize individuals, it impedes, and in the extreme case, even prevents the formation and maintenance of community. By disrupting the delicate nexus of ties, formal and informal, by which we are linked with our neighbors, crime atomizes society and makes of its members mere individual calculators, estimating their own advantage, especially their own chances for survival amidst their fellows." (1.)

Unfortunately, by the time a crime problem grows to unbearable proportions in a neighborhood, it may defy solution. Professor Wilson observes when "'communal social controls' break down--neighbors demand 'the imposition of formal or institutional controls'--demands for 'more police protection,' 'more or better public services,' and so on. The difficulty, however, is that there is relatively little government can do directly to maintain a neighborhood community." (2.) Community associations throughout the country have had the experience of sponsoring mass meetings of outrage following a horrible incident--either a murder or a case of police brutality--only to wither away in frustration when the group fails to solve the problem right away.

A popular belief is that crime would decline if the basic causes of crime--unemployment, bad housing, inadequate social services--were solved. Yet community associations in one neighborhood are hardly in a position to solve any of these problems by themselves, and goverment is turning its back on all of them. Moreover, even efforts to create jobs, rehabilitate abandoned housing, and provide new educational opportunities will fail without a parallel effort to restore the authority of the community where such problems are taking place. A community group can hardly establish its authority when none of the important institutions relating to the neighborhood take the group seriously.

(1.) See p. 41.

(2.) See p. 42.

Dealing with crime in a neighborhood may pit residents against one another. If the area is integrated racially, crime becomes a racial issue, even if whites as well as blacks hassle people on the street corners. If the area is integrated economically, then the middle-class residents will blame the crime on the poor, even if suburban communities are showing us that middle-class people are capable of committing crimes as well. Young people commit many of the crimes that neighborhoods worry about--robberies, muggings, rapes. Yet the parents of a mugger may not even know it. The parent may even deny it, when confronted with the information by the police or neighborhood residents. The parent's instincts will be to defend his or her child, to protect the child against the community. Thus, even communities that think about confronting the families whose children seem to be ringleaders in gangs and street crimes rarely develop the courage to do it. We have not progressed far from the days when the western town waited for the lone sheriff to save it from the gang of bandits before it would gain the courage to enforce the law upon itself.

Indeed, as Dr. David R. Johnson suggests, the crime problem today is not much different from the crime problem 100 years ago.

B. Crime Patterns in Philadelphia 1840-70

by David R. Johnson *

Thomas Welsh, down on his luck, was about to stumble onto a fortune. A clerk in the offices of Jay Cooke & Company, at Third and Chestnut, had spilled the contents of a bag of gold coins he had been counting. While he and the other clerks scurried about on the floor retrieving the money, a shabbily dressed man walked in. Everyone assumed he had business in the rear of the office; but the stranger departed hastily and someone noticed another bag containing $5,000 had disappeared with him. When pursuit proved useless, the clerks notified the police. Headquarters sent officers to watch all the railroad depots and other exit points in the city, and began a fruitless search. Several hours later a prosperous looking fellow walked into a jewelry store only five blocks from the scene of the crime. He bought a ring, paying for it with a $20 gold piece. Another customer, having heard of the robbery, became suspicious because of the mode of payment. He took the liberty of hefting the gentleman's valise, and

*Reprinted by Permission of Temple University Press and the Authors. This chapter appeared originally in Allen Davis and Mark Haller, The Peoples of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1973, pp. 89-107.

thinking it rather heavy, called for the police. After his arrest, Welsh made no attempt to deny the theft, "but said he thought that he needed the money as much as Cooke & Co." (1.)

This robbery typified crime in Philadelphia during the years 1840 to 1870. Opportunity and inclination proved time and again to be the combination which resulted in thefts and assaults. This does not mean that each criminal incident had no larger context. Some thieves, such as Welsh, stole because they either needed or wanted money. For others larceny constituted part of a life style-a group of rowdies might deprive a passing stranger of his cash in order to buy themselves liquor or amusement. Those of a more deliberate turn of mind might plan and execute a burglary of a store or home. (2.) Physical violence often derived from racial prejudice. Rivalries between gangs also accounted for a large number of assault cases. And deep hostilities among volunteer fire companies produced a long series of riots and minor battles which enlivened urban life. Crime was therefore both rational and random: rational because individuals had sufficent reasons (at least in their own minds) to commit these acts; and random because opportunities to steal or to assault someone depended upon time and circumstance.

Crime patterns in the mid-nineteenth century conformed to Philadelphia's demographic changes. In 1840 the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, and Vine and South streets formed the city's political boundaries. The business section, lying along the Delaware River from Walnut to Arch, had penetrated only as far west as Second street. This concentration was only relative. Many merchants maintained warehouses and stores outside this area. Because Philadelphia was still a walking city, her upper classes resided close to their places of work. Few wealthy citizens lived west of Broad or in the various districts surrounding the city. Because of the mixture of residences and businesses, then, there was no commercial nexus in the modern sense. Most Industries were located beyond the political confines of Philadelphia, especially in Spring Garden, Kensington and Southwark. The working classes lived in housing clustered around the factories. A small slum existed along South street, from the Delaware to Seventh, and from Pine (within the city limits) to Fitzwater (in Southwark). This area served as the entry point for immigrants and as the home of Philadelphia's blacks. These spatial arrangements meant that the low-income groups, as well as the least desirable housing, were on the fringe of the city. (3.)

During the next three decades the residential patterns underwent drastic changes. With the advent of the omnibus, the upper classes began to leave the central city for the suburbs. Sidney George Fisher, a local Philadelphian, noted in 1847 that "the taste for country life is increasing here very rapidly. New and tasteful houses are built every year. The neighborhood of Germantown is most desirable." (4.) Led by the wealthier citizens, people began

moving in large numbers toward the northwest and across the Schuylkill into West Philadelphia. The main thrust of this migration was up Ridge Avenue, though many residents also bought new houses within the city, west of Broad. The slum district along South street remained the worst section of the city and expanded slowly toward Broad Street. By 1870 these population movements had reversed the character of the suburbs and city. The outlying districts now contained the best, not the worst, housing. (5.)

Philadelphia's downtown grew steadily as the well-to-do citizens moved outward. Shopkeepers either took over abandoned houses or demolished them to make room for imposing new commercial buildings. These conversions occurred most rapidly on Chestnut street, but the other major east-west avenues (Walnut, Market, and Arch) were not far behind. Some of the north-south streets developed major concentrations of businesses. Third, from Walnut to Willow, and Eighth and Ninth from Walnut to Vine were especially noteworthy for their fine stores. By the mid-1860s the area bounded by Third, Eighth, Market, and Walnut had emerged as the center of the downtown district. The merchants on these streets served the upper and middle classes.

South street became the major shopping thoroughfare for low-income families. A miscellaneous collection of stores, offering a vast assortment of cheap wares, lined this artery running through the heart of the slums. The division of the city's two business districts along socioeconomic lines also occurred in the types of entertainment located near each. While the streets adjacent to Walnut, Chestnut, and Market offered such diversions as theaters and museums, the avenues surrounding South (especially Bedford and Spafford) enticed the passerby with numerous houses of prostitution. (6.)

Philadelphia's property crime patterns closely followed residential and business shifts. (7.) Throughout the period under study the emerging downtown area from the Delaware to Broad, and from Vine to South (wards 5 and 6 after 1854) had a persistent concentration of this type of offense. Sneak thieves, till-tappers, and window smashers victimized merchants in that district. (8.) Shopowners sometimes aided the thieves by placing merchandise on the sidewalk fronting their stores during business hours. Daring sneak thieves simply walked off with whatever they could carry. In the days before cash registers, the merchant kept his money in a till (a drawer under the counter). A group of boys could send the smallest of their number around the counter to raid the till while they occupied the owner's attention. Or

a customer might ask for something which he knew was in the back of the store, and, while the clerk searched for it, the thief reached over the counter and emptied the cash drawer. There were many variations of till-tapping, which seems to have been a favorite endeavor among juveniles.

Thieves also took advantage of improvements in displaying goods. In the 1820s merchants began to replace their old, small shop windows with large bulk windows. (9.) A handy brick or stone and nimble hands combined to make window smashing a prevalent form of larceny by 1840, and the offense continued to plague store keepers throughout the period. Because of the noise involved in this particular crime, its practitioners soon turned to various glass cutting instruments to reduce the possibilities of attracting attention (and perhaps to reduce the chances of getting cut on jagged glass fragments).

As the residential pattern of Philadelphia spread, so did the incidence of thefts from houses. The heaviest concentration of these property losses occurred in those areas where the upper-and middle-income groups settled, especially in the western and northwestern parts of the metropolis. The sneak, or entryway thief, was very prevalent. His victims contributed to his success by habitually leaving coats, hats, umbrellas, boots, and similar wearing apparel hanging on a rack just inside the doorway of a home. The criminal had only to step inside briefly,grab whatever was within reach, and depart. Bolder sneak thieves, posing as service or repairmen, entered homes and stole any watches, jewelry, and clothing that was lying loose. Juveniles were especially persistent depredators. Among their favorite targets were new houses which had not yet been occupied. They broke into many such residences and stripped away the plumbing fixtures to secure the brass and lead. When elaborate door knobs and knockers became popular, youthful thieves developed the ability to quickly rip those objects from their fastenings without undue noise. Even the family wash disappeared frequently, as did any miscellaneous household items carelessly left in view. The cash loss in most of these thefts was low, but these incidents were extremely annoying to the victims.

And finally there was a special class of property crimes, highway robberies, which often shaded into violent attacks on persons. This form of theft occurred anywhere in the city or suburbs, though its perpetrators seem to have favored either side streets or the less densely settled areas. Juveniles and young men, especially those wandering about in small groups, committed many of these offenses. Two social customs aided the thieves. First, most victims usually had enough money in their possession to make the robbery worthwhile. In the days before checking accounts and credit systems, people normally carried their cash

with them when conducting business or while engaged in shopping. In one variation on this practice, merchants employed messenger boys who conveyed large sums from their employers to the banks. This arrangement made robberies even easier, since a juvenile could offer only minimal resistance. Secondly, watches (a favorite target with thieves) were scarce before the Civil War because few people could afford them. Due to their relative rarity, it became customary to ask strangers for the time of day. Thieves used this habit to their advantage. When a pedestrian pulled out his watch in order to answer a query as to the time, the criminal grabbed it and ran. Or, if the watch happened to be attached to a chain, he pulled the victim off balance by jerking the watch toward him, at the same time quieting the owner with a blow on the head. Either method usually proved successful.

Philadelphia's thieves stole everything from washtubs to diamonds. They took everything which might have some cash value because a market existed for these goods. The city's numerous pawnbrokers and junk dealers purchased most of the pilfered items for a fraction of their value, and they asked few questions about ownership. Because those merchants were so willing to buy whatever was offered, the petty thieves (and even the more serious offenders such as burglars) always had a way to convert their day's work into ready cash. A part of the commercial structure of the city therefore provided the incentive for these particular offences. (10.)

Crimes against property, then, tended to concentrate where the property was available: in the commercial district and in the rapidly expanding residential neighborhoods of the relatively well-to-do. Crimes of violence against persons, in contrast, tended to occur where the poor lived. Because the residential areas of the poor remained fairly stable, crimes against persons exhibited a rather stable pattern throughout the period. The center of assaults was located in the heart of the Negro section, around Seventh and Lombard. From there, crimes of violence spread along South Street and from South to near Market via Fifth, Sixth and Seventh. Water and Front streets (close to the Delaware river) also had recurring episodes of attacks on various people. In the old districts, Southwark's residents from South to Wharton consistently experienced a number of these incidents in varying forms. The working-class areas of Northern Liberties and Kensington, with Germantown Road forming an apparant axis, also had a persistent pattern of these offenses.

Customs of a different sort from those involving property crimes produced the opportunities for violence. The city's streets were centers of social life in the nineteenth century. Every evening, and especially on the weekends, the avenues teemed with people seeking relief from the day's tasks. The street corners performed a special function as the focal point for crowds of youths. Numerous citizens throughout the period complained about corner loungers, and the Public Ledger's frequent attacks on the practice led one such "lounger" to write a defense of that habit. He justified his companions' behavior by claiming young men had nowhere else to go, and he asserted it was only natural for them to gather and talk among themselves. Furthermore, he argued that corner loungers had redeeming social values: they helped pull fire engines and were the first to volunteer in wartime. He suggested that, if the citizens of Philadelphia wanted to stop the practice of congregating on the corners, they should provide places for juveniles to go "where we could talk ourselves and not have an orator or preacher do the talking." (11.)

This champion of the corner lounger had a point. Urban society provided few places for recreation, and proper society tended to feel that leisure time should be spent listening to informative lectures or in other educational pursuits. But the weight of the evidence favors the critics of the corner loungers. Unfortunately for many citizens, those youths did a great deal more than talk among themselves. Their amusements also included loud, obscene verbal abuse of other pedestrians. They pelted the passing citizenry with snowballs, rocks, or bricks, and anyone who objected to this treatment faced the prospect of a beating. The loungers' defender correctly noted their eagerness to pull fire engines. Men had to haul these primitive mechanisms to a fire. Long ropes attached to the engine enabled many people to join the regular crew and somewhat increased the speed with which the apparatus arrived at a fire. But the prospect of a good fight probably had much to do with the readiness to help. After a fire, and sometimes while getting to it, the followers of an engine often clashed in battles ranging from a brief fist fight to a full-scale riot.

The corner loungers also swelled the ranks of Philadelphia's gangs. Although no one knows how many of these bands existed, a survey of a single newspaper from 1836 to 1878 uncovered fifty-two gangs which were identified by name. (12.) Whatever the total might have been, the pre-Civil War era was one of the most gang-plagued periods in urban history. These associations concentrated their activities along South street and in Southwark and Moyamensing. Although a few were located in the northern working-class districts, newspaper coverage suggests these were neither as numerous nor as dangerous as their brethren on the south side of town. (13.)

The distribution of violent gangs was due in part to the age composition within the city's wards. In 1840, just before the height of juvenile gang activity, those ages which tended to form these associations (ten to fourteen and fifteen to nineteen) comprised 3.6 and 4.4 percent of the total city population. Cedar Ward (bounded by Seventh, Spruce, the Schuylkill River, and South street) had 12.9 and 9.6 percent, respectively, in those age categories. Among the ten- to fourteen-year-olds that was the highest density in the entire city. Other wards had percentages higher than the average, but none had so many violent gangs operating within its borders. (14.)

Newspaper accounts said little about the internal structure of these bands. The author of a fictional romance dealing with an actual gang, the Killers, left the only contemporary description of that group's composition: (15.)

> They were divided into three classes-beardless apprentice boys who after a hard day's work were turned loose upon the street at night, by their masters or bosses. Young men of nineteen and twenty, who fond of excitement, had assumed the name and joined the gang for the mere fun of the thing, and who would either fight for a man or knock him down, just to keep their hand in; and fellows with countenances that reminded of the brute and devil well intermingled. These last were the smallest in number, but the most ferocious of the three.

The Killers, according to this account, used an abandoned building as their headquarters. Other gangs also had clubhouses, but most had only a street corner which they reserved for themselves. The vast majority of these groups had very short lives of three years or less. But a few persisted for much longer periods. The Schuylkill Rangers held the record (at least twenty-six years). Others, like the Buffers (ten years), the Forty Thieves (nine), and the Snakers (seven), provided additional exceptions to the general rule of a short, violent life. (16.)

Street warfare between rival gangs formed one of the basic themes of city life during the middle years of the nineteenth century. These clashes generally occurred in the evenings and lasted as long as the participants felt like fighting. Any law officer who appeared on the scene did so at his peril. The weaponry ranged from fists to pistols. Since the newspapers usually listed only fatalities, not more minor injuries, it is difficult to judge how deadly this behavior became. Battles erupted so frequently, however, that the fighting developed some semiformal aspects. By 1850 there was an area of ground known as the "Battlefield" where opposing bands met regularly for combat. The place even attracted spectators who watched the fun and offered encouragement to their favorites. (17.)

Gangs provided one type of organized violence. As the previous chapter makes clear, the volunteer fire companies supplied a related, and in some ways more serious, form of disruption. The volunteer system had been a product of necessity in the eighteenth century when fire posed one of the greatest hazards to urban life. That danger persisted throughout the nineteenth century as well, but while the problem remained, the nature of fire fighters changed. Initially composed of the "best citizens," the membership in many companies shifted by the 1830s to include some of the worst elements in society. (18.)

The conflicts between these rival associations became the major source of organized violence before the Civil War. Though fires were too frequent to suit most city residents, the volunteers' brawls had reached the point by the 1840s where many blazes were set deliberately to provoke a riot. As a company charged along a street in the direction of a fire, its opponent either collided with it, or lay in ambush. The engine was the supreme prize in these affairs, and several valuable pieces of equipment received severe damage or were totally destroyed in the battles. Any fire, incendiary or otherwise, became an excuse to fight. Whenever two companies met, the encounter usually ended in some form of combat. Most of these engagements were brief, but some went on for hours, covered several city blocks, and occasionally continued the next day or evening. (19.)

One source of this conflict derived from the circumstances surrounding fire fighting. In the early nineteenth century good-natured contests to be first to a blaze, and first to a hydrant, slowly altered into determined battles between claimants for those honors. (20.) Once this change occurred, partisans of one or another organization began attempting to prevent competitors from arriving at all. Fights developed on the route to a conflagration. As rowdies infiltrated some companies, the crowds which usually followed the engines also changed. Corner loungers and gangs attached themselves to several fire associations. When rivals, reinforced by their supporters, met in the streets, the excitement of the moment combined with an eagerness for combat to produce an outbreak of violence.

Deeply rooted social conditions also accounted for this warfare. Religious differences provided one excuse for conflict. The Irish Catholics of Moyamensing Hose hated the Irish Protestants belonging to Franklin Hose. Their fights were among the most savage contests which occurred. Community loyalties formed another basis for trouble. Many volunteers came from the same neighborhood. This gave cohesion to an outfit, but it also made the company competitive with others formed along similar lines. The internal structure of these organizations also contributed to a combative nature. Firehouses were built to include

living quarters or a meeting place for members. What had been public associations had become private clubs for the city's young men who had few other places to spend their time. This social aspect of fire fighting bred the same sort of pride as that connected with neighborhoods. The sense of belonging expressed itself in such rituals as elaborate parades and in battles with rivals. (21.)

Small groups of rowdies wandering through the streets constituted another form of violence. Unprovoked assaults occurred with distressing frequency on the city's south side and in the less densely settled areas to the north. The victim might be a rival gang member, a lonely stroller, a man (or woman) suddenly slashed by a knife as he brushed past a gathering of juveniles, or-especially along South street-a Negro. Racial antagonism kept the ghetto area in turmoil for years. Philadelphia experienced five major anti-Negro riots between 1829 and 1849. In the intervals between major battles, White and Black youths constantly attacked on another. Raids and reprisals became commonplace and kept tensions high until the mid 1850s. Though the antagonists behind these assaults seems to have declined somewhat by 1860, it flared occasionally after that date, as in 1871 when a minor race riot erupted. (22.)

Law officers were also frequent victims of assaults by bands of rowdies. Until the city and districts consolidated in 1854, the policing establishments in the metropolitan area suffered due to inadequate manpower and conflicting jurisdiction. A watchman pursuing an offender had to give up when the culprit crossed into another district. Roaming toughs took full advantage of this state of affairs. When a policeman interfered in an assault, they frequently turned upon him and beat him badly. Officers who attempted to disperse corner loungers also faced the prospect of an attack. If help arrived during these affairs, the rowdies simply headed for the nearest dividing line. In a refinement of this situation, some malefactors took to shooting at patrolmen of one district while standing in another. Under these circumstances, officers had great difficulty maintaining any semblance of public order. (23.)

Footnotes

1. Philadelphia Public Ledger, Jan. 20, 1863.

2. This paper concentrates on non-professional crime. One did not have to be a professional criminal to plot a burglary. Disgruntled clerks, teenage gangs, and men like Welsh were perfectly capable of plundering businesses and homes.

3. Sam B. Warner, Jr., The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of its Growth (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), chap 3. Stuart Blumin. "Mobility and Change in Ante-Bellum Philadelphia," in Nineteenth Century Cities: Essays in the New Urban History, Stephan Thernstrom and Richard Sennett, eds. (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 187-90. W.E.B. DuBois, The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study (New York: Schocken Books, 1967) pp. 302-3.

4. Nicholas B. Wainwright, ed., A Philadelphia Perspective: the Diary of Sidney George Fisher covering the years from 1834 to 1871 (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967), p. 202.

5. Kenneth T. Jackson, "Urban Deconcentration and Suburbanization in the Nineteenth Century" (unpublished paper in the possession of the author). North American and United States Gazette, September 12, 1859.

6. The movement of the downtown has been traced through accounts in the Public Ledger; see, for example: Nov. 11, Dec. 15, 1847; March 29, 1848; Dec. 19, 1850; April 4, 1851; Jan. 13, Feb. 23, 27, 1855; June 17, 1856; Aug. 31, 1857; Jan. 14, Feb. 29, Mar. 20, April 12, 14, 1860; July 26, 1864; Aug. 30, 1865; July 23, 1869; April 26 (supp.), April 30 (supp.), May 3 (supp.), 1873. With regard to the locations of respectable amusements and houses of prostitution, cf. The Stranger's Guide to Philadelphia and its Environs (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1854), pp. 48-53, and the Public Ledger, June 10, December 19, 1840; November 30, 1852. See in addition George R. Taylor, ed., "Philadelphia in Slices: Slice IV: Dandy Hall," George C. Foster, Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 93 (Jan. 1969):39.

7. The discussion of crimes against both property and persons is based on a sample taken from the Public Ledger at 10-year intervals. In each year, every other day's catalogue of incidents was examined and the author recorded every crime story in which a geographic location was given. This method resulted in a record of the following number of incidents:

Year	Property	Personal
1840	122	68
1850	117	116
1860	143	47
1870	272	104

8. Pickpockets and shoplifters also plagued storeowners, but by the 1840s they tended to be professional thieves and are therefore omitted from this discussion.

9. John F. Watson, Annals of Philadelphia...(Philadelphia: E.L. Carey and A. Hart, 1830), p. 201.

10. Watson, Annals, pp. 218-19. Public Ledger, January 5, 1844: September 15, 1871: letter to editor signed "Honest Dealer," February 14, 1874 (supp.).

11. Letter to editor signed "A Corner Lounger," Public Ledger, July 25, 1856. Examples of complaints against loungers are: Ibid., July 19, 1859; March 29, 1867; March 8, 1873 (supp.); June 16, 1877 (supp.).

12. The gangs, with the dates when they appeared in the Public Ledger, were: Bleeders, June 17, 1851; Blood Tubs, July 17, 1855; Blossoms, Feb. 1, 1848; Bouncers, Feb. 1, 1848; Buffers, May 5, 1845, June 4 1845, July 17, 1855; Bugs, July 17, 1855; Bulldogs, Feb. 21, 1848; Centre Street Boys, May 2, 1872; Chesapeakes, March 7, 1845; Crockets, Oct. 6, 1845; Darts, Dec. 1, 1869; Deathfetchers, Feb. 1, 1848; Dogs, June 21, 1860; Dog-Towners, May 2, 1872; The Forty-Thieves, Sept. 21, 1868, Dec. 29, 1869, Jan 24, 1870, July 15, 1871, Fe. 23, 1877; Garroters, Feb. 29, 1860; Gumballs, Oct. 29, 1844, April 1, 1845, Feb. 1, 1848; Hyenas, Dec. 19, 1844, Feb. 1, 1848; Jack of Clubs, Dec. 30, 1857; Jumpers, Oct. 29, 1844, Aug. 2, 1845, Feb. 1, 1848; Juniatta Club, Jan. 22, 1872; Keystone No 2, Sept. 30, 1850; Killers, Aug. 2, 1847, Feb. 1, 1848; Lancers, Jan. 20, 1854; Molly Maguires, Aug. 7, 1878; Neckers, Aug. 10, 1848; Pickwick Club, Aug. 19, 1844; Pluckers, Feb. 1, 1848; Pots No 2, Sept. 30, 1850; Privateer Club No. 1, Nov. 26, 1847, Jan 22, 1850, March 18, 1850; Rats, May 28, 1845; Oct. 16, 1845, Nov. 23, 1847, Feb. 1, 1848; Rangers, March 7, 1845, Feb. 21, 1848; Reading Hose Club, Dec. 5, 1873, Sept. 4, 1876; Rebels, Dec. 11, 1845; Red Roses, July 18, 1860; Reed Birds, June 22, 1850; Schuylkill Rangers, Aug. 14, 1850, Oct. 16, 1854, July 23, 1860, March 6, July 26, 1876; Shifflers, May 28, 1845, June 4, 1845; Skinners, Dec. 9, 1844, March 7, 1845, Oct. 16, 1845; Smashers, June 22, 1850; Snakers, Feb. 1, 1848, Aug 11, 1855; Snappers, Dec. 19, 1844, Feb. 1, 1848; Spiggots, Dec. 21, 1857, June 21, 1860; Sporters, Dec. 9, 1844; Springers, Jan. 3, 1855; Stockholders, May 12, 1854; Tormentors, Feb. 1, 1848, Feb. 8, 1850, June 17, 1851, Jan 16, 1854; Turks, Aug. 15, 1850, Nov. 20, 1850; The Vesper Social, March 8, 1878; Weecys, Oct. 16, 1845; Wild Cats, May 28, 1845; Waynetowners, Oct. 24, 1850.

13. This summary is based on the author's examination of 134 incidents involving gangs which the Public Ledger reported between 1840 and 1878.

14. Calculated from the Sixth Census or Enumeration of Inhabitants of the United States, 1840, p. 150.

15. Anon., Life and Adventures of Charles Anderson Chester, the Notorious Leader of the Philadelphia "Killers" (Philadelphia: Yates and Smith, 1850), pp. 27-28.

16. Determined from data given in n. 12.

17. Public Ledger, April 30, 1850.

18. J. Thomas Scharff and Thompson Westcott, History of Philadelphia, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts, 1884), 3: 1883 ff. George R. Taylor, ed., "Philadelphia in Slices: Slice III: The Rowdy Clubs," by George C. Foster, Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 93 (January, 1969): 35-36.

19. Public Ledger, Jan. 30, 1844; Jan 25, 1848; April 19, 1850; July 1, 1850, Sept. 24, 1858; Nov. 7, 1865; Sept. 17, 1866. Scharf and Westcott, History of Philadelphia, 2:691-92.

20. Andrew J. Neilly, "The Violent Volunteers: a History of the Volunteer Fire Department of Philadelphia, 1736-1871" (unpublished diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1959), p. 28.

21. Public Ledger, April 16, 1850. Scharf and Westcott, History of Philadelphia, 3: 1887-88, 1899-1901, 1910. Neilly, "The Violent Volunteers," pp. 130, 143. I am indebted to Professor Bruce Laurie for pointing out the religious difference among the fire companies.

22. Leon F. Litwack, North of Slavery; the Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860 (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 100. Scharf and Westcott, History of Philadelphia, 1:837.

23. The Public Ledger reported numerous assaults on policemen: see, for example, Feb. 2, 14, 1840; Feb. 27, 1845, July 23, 1850; March 20, Aug. 24, 1855; Aug. 27, Oct. 20, 1860; Jan. 17, 1865; Feb. 1, March 22, 1870.

C. A Sense of Security

When the issue of crime is broadened to include a sense of security within the neighborhood as a whole, it becomes even more complex. Does a crowd of young people standing on a street corner constitute a threat to neighborhood security, even if it hassles nobody who passes by? Should all young people be inside by 10:30, the hour of curfews in many American cities? How much crime does it take before a neighborhood concludes that it is going downhill? In The Urban Neighborhood, Suzanne Keller distinguishes between the "respectable" and "rough" neighborhood, pointing out that the "respectables" are "more home-centered, conventional, usually better off financially, and morally more consistent and controlled," while the "rough" neighborhoods are often "relatively poor, more disorganized, and unconventional in manners and morals, especially when seen from the perspective of middle-class morality." (3.) Obviously,

(3.) See P.42.

the neighborhoods would differ in their perceptions of what makes for security, and when residents with different standards live in the same neighborhood, they often disagree on whether the community really has a problem in this area.

Therefore, it is critical that a neighborhood activist or leader get a clear sense of the community's standards of security from the start. Obviously, everyone would agree that homes should be safe from breaking and entering, and that citizens should be able to walk the streets without fear of being mugged, raped or robbed. What is the environment that will give neighborhood residents this feeling, however? Is it just the knowledge that there have been few crimes in the neighborhood, or does it take quiet, empty streets to convince neighbors that the streets are safe? An understanding of what a community thinks a safe neighborhood should look like will suggest to the community activist what his or her objective ought to be.

What, in effect, is the crime rate in the community? Does the activist know? What kind of crimes are most frequent, and where do they occur? Are some streets particularly "bad", while others seem protected or do people associate crime with the entire neighborhood? If there is a history of gang activity in the neighborhood, do people know what the turf is? Do people worry most about crimes in their home, or do the streets pose a threat as well?

What is the pattern of police activity in the neighborhood? Are policemen stationed in the neighborhood, are there foot patrols or do they merely drive through once in a while? How fast do the police respond when called? What is their attitude toward complaints--do they convey a sense that they can do something, or do they convey the feeling that there's not much that can be done after an incident? What is the record of police arrests leading to conviction within the precinct that covers your neighborhood?

How do the neighborhood residents view the police? Do they see the Department as there to help them, doing the best they can under difficult conditions? Or are the residents cynical about the ability of the police to respond to crime? Do residents complain that, "the police never come when you call them?" Have there been incidents of police brutality in the neighborhood--or, as important, do people <u>believe</u> that there have been incidents of police brutality? What, in general, is the relationship between the police and the community?

Finally, how much responsibility would the neighborhood residents accept in dealing with issues of crime? This question gets to the heart of the issue that the community activist must raise. We have developed a number of institutions to preserve law and order--police departments, courts, prisons, rehabilitation centers. Obviously, if crime rates rise in a neighborhood, it proves that these institutions are not accomplishing their goal. The responsibility to make up the difference, then, returns to the community residents. Will they take it, or will many wait for an opportunity to move to a neighborhood where the crime rate is low? A definition of an abandoned neighborhood, in fact, would be one in which the only people who remain are those who can't afford to move out. Crime is one of the main reasons why such a situation might come about, but what would the residents be prepared to do to prevent it?

Finally, how would the neighbors define the major problem of security? Do they feel that the preservation of law and order should be the responsibility of each family in cooperation with law enforcement agencies-that the problem therefore is isolating offenders from the community? Or do they feel that rising crime rates, particularly involving young people, reflect the bad environment affecting young people, an environment they would work to change? Or would they work in both directions? Understanding this dimension of a neighborhood's attitudes will suggest whether a unified community strategy to deal with crime will be possible.

Crime is identified today as a social issue, a racial issue, an economic issue, an ethnic issue. It is all of these things. Yet it is an enduring issue, rooted in the history of America and in the cities throughout the world. When animals are treated badly, they turn out badly. Human beings are more resilient, but not that much more. When their environments and social conditions are without dignity and without direction, when they face hard obstacles in achieving the basic necessities of life, particularly when they think that others face no such obstacles, these injustices are bound to have an impact on their attitudes and behavior. In the 19th Century, the Italians and Irish were blamed for urban crime. Today, it is blacks and Spanish speaking people. The question for a neighborhood, however, is not who is committing crime, but how the neighborhood can put a stop to it, and find some alternative that will channel potential delinquents into constructive activity.

Footnotes

1. James Q. Wilson, Thinking About Crime (New York, Basic Books, 1975), p. 21.

2. Ibid., p. 35.

3. Suzanne Keller, The Urban Neighborhood (New York, Random House, 1968), p. 161.

D. Questions for Discussion

1. Imagine that the residents of your community were meeting to discuss problems of security in your neighborhood. If they were asked to develop a social contract governing their own standards of security, what would it be? List all the rules for neighborhood security that you think your neighbors would agree on.

2. Are there any rules that some people in the neighborhood might agree to support, but that others would not? Which ones? Why?

3. Now look at the rules that your neighbors have developed. Which ones are already enforced--that is, there is no problem in the neighborhood in that area?

4. Which rules would have to require additional action to be enforced? For example, if the neighbors agreed to a rule against housebreaking, but there is an epidemic of housebreaking in the neighborhood, this is an example of a rule that would require additional action. List all such examples.

5. Now look back at the rules that require additional enforcement. Which ones could be enforced if the neighbors themselves took more responsibility for their community? Which ones would require additional police action?

6. Now imagine the following familiar situation: the neighbors have agreed to a rule against people running across one another's front porches. The kids in one family on the block, however, are always running across one another's front porches. What should the neighbors do to enforce the rule? How can they enforce the rule in a way that strengthens the community, instead of unnecessarily dividing it?

7. Take all the other rules that additional action from the community could handle. How would the community association get the neighbors to agree to those rules without unnecessarily antagonizing everyone?

8. Now take all the rules that would require additional police action. List exactly what you want the police to do.

Imagine that you are meeting with the police department. How would you persuade the department to help you enforce the rules that you have enacted? What procedure would you want to create to insure that the police department or precinct is living up to its agreement with the neighborhood?

E. For Further Reading

A National Strategy to Reduce Crime: A Report by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards are Goals, New York, Avon, 1975.

Thinking About Crime, James Q. Wilson, New York, Basic Books, 1975.

To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility, The Final Report of the National Commission on the Causes and the Prevention of Violence, New York, Bantam, 1970.

UNIT III. THE VALUE OF RECIPROCITY

A. The Problem of Privatism

The word "reciprocity" is not often used in discussions of neighborhood problems, but the concept is critical to understanding them. It means mutuality, give-and-take, a fair return. When a person sends a gift, he or she generally expects a thank-you note--that is, that the receiver will reciprocate. When we go to somebody's party, we feel obligated to invite him or her to the next party that we give. This is reciprocity. Workers expect a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Consumers expect a decent product for their money. These specific expectations are part of our broader belief that reciprocity ought to govern our relationships with people, even with people we don't know.

Many critics of the city today contend that urban life is distinguished by its lack of reciprocity in important areas of economic and political life. An articulate spokesman for this point of view is Dr. Sam Bass Warner of Boston College. Dr. Warner's book, The Private City, argues that regardless of William Penn's original dream, the City of Philadelphia is now characterized by privatism. This value, moreover, dominates most American cities. Dr. Warner suggests that the results have been devastating in all areas of public policy. This brief passage spells out the implications for the urban poor and the urban neighborhoods.

"The Industrial Metropolis as an Inheritance"

From The Private City, by Sam Bass Warner *
Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania
Press, 1968

> The quality which above all characterizes our urban inheritance is privatism. By and large the productivity and social order of the metropolis flowed from private institutions and individual adjustments. So did its weaknesses. Privatism left the metropolis helpless to guarantee its citizens a satisfactory standard of living. Privatism encouraged the building of vast new sections of the city in a manner well below contemporary standards of good layout and construction. Privatism suffered and abetted a system of politics which was so weak it could not deal effectively with the economic, physical, and social events that determined the quality of life within the city. In short, the industrial metropolis of 1930, like the colonial town, and big city

Reprinted by Permission of University of Pennsylvania Press

which had preceded it, was a private city and the public dimensions of urban life suffered accordingly.

PRIVATISM AND THE MALDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

Reliance on private institutions and private wealth as the basic mode of social organization in the metropolis produced the notorious failing of the modern American city. Thousands of families lived below an adequate standard of food, clothing, housing, and employment in a metropolis of unprecedented wealth and productivity. There were just more poor people in Philadelphia in the 1920's than there needed to be.

Many charities, agencies of government and individual investigators had reported on the manifestations of the maldistribution of income. For years the Octavia Hill Association had published accounts of Philadelphia slum housing; the University of Pennsylvania had commissioned W.E. Burghardt DuBois to study poverty among the city's Negroes; the City Planning Commission had become concerned over the decline in value and condition of buildings in the heart of Philadelphia; the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity had been swamped with applicants when it undertook to offer a little unemployment relief in 1922. (1.)

The Industrial Relations Committee of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, meeting in April 1929, a few months before the great crash, understood the city's unsolved economic problems well enough. Since in the private city a family's income depended upon employment there must be steady employment for all.

> It is the hope of your committee that American industry will rise to this responsibility and that Philadelphia businessmen will take a leading part in working out the means by which we may approach the ideal solution, namely,

1. Harland B. Phillips, "A War on Philadelphia's Slums: Walter Vrooman and the Conference on Moral Workers, 1893," Pennsylvania Magazine, LXXVI (January, 1952), 47-62. The Octavia Hall Association's reports begin in 1895. The next big report is W.E. Burghardt DuBois, The Philadelphia Negro (University of Pennsylvania, Series in Political Economy and Public Law 14; Philadelphia, 1899), 164-196. The lack of progress in the twentieth century, report on the Planning Commission in, Mayor of Philadelphia, Third Annual Report of Harry A. Mackey (Philadelphia, 1931), 747; the failure of the Philadelphia system of private administration of public charity, Leah H. Feder, Unemployment Relief in Periods of Depression, a Study of Measures Adopted in Certain American Cities, 1857-1922 (New York, 1936) 308-314.

> that every person who is honestly seeking should be able to find work that is suited to his capacities, under conditions that are reasonable; and that when he has to change from one job to another, it should be possible for him to do so without reducing himself and his family to living conditions that will deteriorate them. (2.)

Thousands of families lived in conditions that "deteriorated them" in the 1920's in Philadelphia as they did in every other American city, but the city's businessmen had not risen to their responsibility, nor taken a leading part in doing much about it. On the contrary, some Philadelphia firms built plants outside the metropolis to escape the costs of maintaining their Philadelphia employee's higher wages and high living standards. (3.)

In respect to the problems of full employment and the distribution of income Philadelphia faced the kind of political situation it had confronted in the early nineteenth century when it sought intercity canals and railroads. Since in neither case could the city attain its ends only by its own efforts, the achievement of its goals depended upon a united campaign before the state legislature and U.S. Congress by Philadelphia's legislative representatives, its municipal corporation, and its business leaders. In the early nineteenth century such united efforts had brought expensive improvements in the Delaware River, canals to Baltimore and Pittsburgh, and later a railroad to the West. In the twentieth century to improve the condition of its poor Philadelphia would have had to make common cause with other large American cities. Indeed since all large cities then suffered similar problems, coalitions for welfare legislation should have been easier to form and maintain than they had been in the nineteenth century when many cities and towns saw themselves as competitors for transportation.

2. Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, Industrial Relations Committee, Program for Regularization of Employment and the Decrease of Unemployment in Philadelphia (conference held April, 1929).11

3. C. Canby Balderson, The Philadelphia Upholstery Weaving Industry (Philadelphia, 1932), 18; the whole migration of textiles from Philadelphia between World War I and II can be similarly regarded, Gladys L. Palmer, Philadelphia Workers in a Changing Economy (Philadelphia 1956),43-44.

To be sure the devices of today's welfare economics were not available in the 1920's, but a number of effective measures for alleviating poverty were well known, had been tried in Europe and America, and had been urged upon the public by Progressives and Socialists since before World War I. Such measures were: health insurance, unemployment insurance, minimum wage and hour regulation, flexible public works programming, and progressive taxation. Yet neither Philadelphia nor other large cities in America sought national coalitions to alleviate common poverty.

The very internal organization of the industrial metropolis foreclosed such a possibility. The privatism which had built the city and ordered its population into separate work groups and into income-segregated residential districts prevented any active public concern for poverty or unemployment in times of prosperity. The well-to-do of Philadelphia knew the regional and national scale of business; it was the scope of their daily activity, and they knew that this must be the scale of effective public measures. Their interests, however, were not focused on the poor of Philadelphia. Rather, they formed state and national coalitions to protect their tariff interests. The downtown business leaders were concerned with local issues, but they were also of no use for poverty and welfare issues. Their interests were for real estate, traffic and civic beautification. They, like all the well-to-do of the metropolis, hid behind a screen of Philadelphia'a many private charities. The very committee of the Chamber of Commerce which wrote the appeal to the city's business leaders to save the city's families from the suffering of uncertain employment had nothing practical to offer because it refused to consider national unemployment insurance!

Lacking leadership from the city's businessmen, with the poor confined to their own neighborhoods, and with unemployment striking only scattered workers at any given moment, the ordinary Philadelphian in the 1920's went about his personal affairs unconcerned. The vast majority of the city's families had learned to cope with the economic system on a personal basis, by friendships and aid from relatives. Thousands of families continued to suffer the pains and indignities of poverty; the slums went unmended, and the Bureau of Personal Assistance of the City of Philadelphia continued in its absurd task of separating the "worthy" from the "unworthy" poor. (4.)

4. Mayor of Philadelphia, Third Annual Message of Harry A. Mackey, 530.

PRIVATISM AND THE BUILDING PROCESS

Like the city's inability to deal effectively with its standard-of-living problems, the building habits of Philadelphia in the twenties left later generations with a legacy of failure. The fault also clearly lay with the tradition of privatism. Such a large share of land division and new construction remained in the hands of the private real estate market that despite very considerable efforts at municipal planning the city failed to cope successfully with the disorders it inherited in the old areas or the process of substandard building it faced in its areas of new growth.

The twentieth-century planning task required two things: first, a public institution or institutions that could make sure that land division, siting, and building at the growing edge of the city met the best standards of the day. Second, twentieth-century planning also required that public investments in the old sections of the city be not tied down to serving a small fraction of the city's interests. The industrial metropolis failed to create the necessary institutions to control the city's growth and to allocate the city's public investments effectively.

In Philadelphia, no less than in other large American cities, the early twentieth century was a period of active interest in city planning. Indeed, formal physical planning in most American cities began with this generation.

Since 1871 the Philadelphia Board of Surveyors of the municipal corporation had been empowered to make general plans for the future development of the city, but it never had a large or ambitious enough staff to do any such planning. The day-to-day demands of real estate men, lawyers, engineers, and city offices for drawings of street alignments, grades, set-back lines, and approval of subdivision plots consumed all the small office's energies. (5.)

Physical planning really began in Philadelphia in 1905 with the City Councils' acceptance of a citizens committee proposal to build the Fairmount Parkway boulevard connecting City Hall with a new art museum at the edge of the park. The proposal was a typical City Beautiful plan of the kind then sweeping the nation. Mayor John E. Rayburn enlarged upon this parkway effort by requesting that the Board of Survey conduct studies for downtown traffice improvement, and he also created a large committee of businessmen to work up plans for the city. Finally, the new 1919 Philadelphia municipal charter authorized the establishing of a regular planning commission. Intermittently ever since 1919, the Philadelphia municipal corporation

5. Mayor of Philadelphia, First Annual Message of J. Hampton Moore (Philadelphia, 1921), 237; Robert S. Glover, Survey of the Housing Situation in Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania PhD Thesis, 1933), 80.

has been engaged in city planning. (6.)

Planning as then practiced by these municipal and businessmen's boards did not mean consciously allocating the city's scarce resources among the items of a comprehensive five or ten year plan. These planners did not endeavor to see that the new public and private investment in the city would conform to some overall program for housing, green space, public utilities, transport, municipal services, employment, and welfare. Rather planning in the early twentieth century was something carried on by a limited group of people to deal with a limited set of issues.

The people who planned, or who sat on planning commissions were downtown merchants, utility, transit, and bank directors, real estate men, railroad and ocean transport carriers, and a few professionals (i.e. perennial Philadelphia board sitters, architects, and civil engineers). The issues that concerned these commissions matched the commissioners: transit, the relief of traffic congestions by parkway and new downtown street construction, inner-city transportation improvements, especially terminals and wharves, and parks and parkway beautification. In the mid-twenties, a concern for promoting the tourist trade was added to this list of interests.

By their personnel and their subject matter these first planning commissions continued the old American urban tradition of businessmen taking an active role in persuading the public and the municipal corporation to improve the commercial environment of the city. In this era the unique ingredient was the strong effort in behalf of the downtown and intracity transportation as opposed to the concerns for intercity business of the nineteenth century. Yet, despite the concentration of benefit on the downtown such was the strength of the tradition and its sanction of public support of business that a great deal of the planning commission's recommendations carried.

These early commissions had no public powers or budgets beyond the funds granted for studies and the publication of recommendations. Yet, to a remarkable extent their proposals became projects and were built: the Fairmount (now Benjamin Franklin) Parkway, the Schuylkill River Parkways, the Roosevelt Parkway in the northeast, the convention hall, the transit extension along Broad Street, and the River Avenue loop, the Benjamin Franklin Bridge, and

(6.) City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, I (July, 1909), 4-7, Jacque Grèber, Le Fairmount Parkway à Philadelphia," La Vie Urbaine (New Series, Jan-Mars, 1962), 1-18; City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, IV (Comprehensive Plans Number," March 11, 1911), 3-12; Werner Hegemann and Elbert Peets, The American Vitruvius: an Architect's Handbook of Civic Art (New York, 1922), 249-250, 259-260.

the wharf and terminal facilities of south Philadelphia. (7.)

Except for the wharves and terminals, and perhaps the Roosevelt Parkway which was part of a state highway to New York City, all the projects in one way or another were downtown-oriented. All were to bring traffic to the downtown, to beautify it, and to raise or maintain downtown business property values. It was a remarkable effort, some of it, like the Fairmount Parkway and the transit extensions, involving massive municipal investments. The state helped with the bridge and road projects, the W.P.A. with the completion of the transit system, but the city and private funds financed the overwhelming fraction of the total outlay.

This effort, which might best be characterized as modernizing the inner city, since it added facilities former generations would not have thought necessary or even conceived of, over-committed the municipal corporation to inner-city projects. It left too little funds, and too little energy, for other kinds of municipal enterprise, or for work in other sections of the city. For instance, increases in school attendance during the early twentieth century brought a crisis in school facilities. Despite a very heavy school-building program in the twenties overcrowding continued in many classrooms of the city. (8.)

The City Beautiful aesthetic and the downtown interests of the planning boards also did not encompass a concern for the smaller clusters of the city. The two-dozen odd shopping streets and retail clusters of the city badly needed modernizing if they were not to be destroyed by the automobile. Nothing was done for these lesser commercial areas, which were, for the majority of Philadelphians, their principal community centers. (9.) Finally, the level of recreation,

7. Mayor of Philadelphia, Third Annual Message of Harry A. Mackey (Philadelphia, 1931), 747-9, lists current projects and shows the overlapping of personnel and personnel types with the early 1911 board of Mayor Reyburn and the later board of the Regional Plan of 1932.

8. School crowding: "A Seat for Every Child," Evening Bulletin (October 26, 1923), editorial; Franklin D. Edmunds, A Chronological List of the Public School Buildings of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1934), 90-103; Board of Education, School district of Philadelphia, Annual Report of the Superintendant of Public Schools (Philadelphia, 1925),11-21.

9. A map of retail locations in Philadelphia and some pictures of neighborhood stores appears in Malcolm J. Proudfoot, "City Retail Structure," Economic Geography, XIII (October, 1937), 325-428.

police, and health services of Philadelphia in the twenties was so low that the entire city could have benefited from more allocations in these directions. The heavy downtown commitment, however, like the municipal corporation's subscription to canal and railroad bonds in the early nineteenth century, was the inevitable consequence of Philadelphia's and America's tradition. The tradition held that the business of a city was business. In the 1920's the downtown was both the popular symbol of the "pep" and success of business; it was also the locus of business's political power.

Although the projects of the Philadelphia Planning Commissions took a very strong inner-city bias, the interest of some Philadelphia businessmen in transportation, utilities, and parks led them to follow these subjects to their full metropolitan scale. In 1923 a group of Philadelphia businessmen, both downtown-oriented merchants and bankers, and national corporations executives, joined their opposites from Camden, Trenton, New Jersey, and Wilmington, Delaware, to establish a Tri-State Regional Planning Federation. The federation was a privately supported group established to study and make recommendations for land development, transportation, water supply, and parks for the entire region. The group raised $600,000, and published its recommendations for regional improvement in 1932. The project was carried on in the spirit of the 1909 Chicago plan. As in Chicago the federation had no public powers, it made recommendations and lobbied befor state and county governments in its own behalf. The group did not propose a metropolitan government agency; rather it expected to continue as a federation of citizens' planning associations in each of the eleven counties of the three-state region.

The subject of the federation's plan was growth; its theme was the orderly programming of municipal and private investments according to a scheme which took into account the projected fifty-year growth of the region. The goal was conservation of land through an allocation among green space, housing, and industry. It was hoped that through planning, substantial savings to the metropolitan region could be effected by the coordination of some of the heavy capital investments in transportation, utilities, and water supply. (10.)

10. Regional Planning Federation of the Philadelphia Tri-State District, The Regional Plan (Philadelphia, 1932), 1-22. A good discussion of the Chicago Plan, John W. Reps, The Making of Urban America (Princeton,1965), 497-502.

Over and over again, in pictures, and in the text, The Regional Plan stressed the failure of the metropolis to control its own growth. The disorders noted were many: houses where highways, parks, and industries should be, barren, ugly subdivisions, traffic jams, heavy expenses in expanding utilities, transport and regional services, the failure to reserve adequate space for groupings of industry and stores.

The Regional Plan was written at the time when the Pennsylvania legislature had just authorized zoning ordinances in the state, and hopes ran high for the future benefits of the land use and building bulk classifications of common zoning procedures. These zoning laws were not novel in their regulations. Rather they enacted on a city-wide basis what had become common good practice in middle-income developments. The new zoning laws, by forbidding industries in residential zones or apartments next to single family houses, enacted as law what had become by the twentieth century the norm for new residential areas. (11.)

The Regional Plan, after recommending zoning ordinances to communities which did not yet have them, went on to observe that zoning could only prevent certain abuses; it could not ensure good building. The Regional Plan clearly stated that the key to achieving a satisfactory metropolitan development was good design of the new suburban communities. Such design meant: attention to the arrangement of stores to see that trips to stores, jobs, and houses would help make coherent communities; arrangement of house lots to preserve recreation space and to take advantage of the inherent beauties of the landscape; siting of houses on their lots to ensure a good final effect when all the lots had been build upon; hiring good architects for the design of the buildings themselves.

There can be no question but that these design objectives were obtainable in the 1920's and that the results would have proved more satisfactory both to their first occupants and to later generations than the mass suburbs then being built. The examples cited in The Regional Plan showed what could have been done with a different organization of the land subdivision and housing market: Radburn in Fair Lawn, New Jersey; Yorkship Village in Camden, New Jersey; French Village (McCallum Street) in Chestnut

11. The hopes and limitations for zoning, Mayor of Philadelphia, Third Annual Message of Harry A. Mackey (Philadelphia, 19131),775-776

Hill, Philadelphia. Yet because the businessmen of the regional plan commission and its authors were unwilling to confront the conflict between their goals of satisfactory metropolitan development and the daily product of private city building they had neither institution, law, nor technique of purpose. Because of their unwillingness to disturb the private market in land they, like American city planners ever since, were helpless to prevent the continued destructive process of metropolitan building which their reports castigated. (12.)

The problem of securing good design for the growing edge of the metropolis turned on the peculiar nature of the private building process. An ordinary city or suburban structure will stand at least sixty or a hundred years before being radically remodeled or torn down. Thus, all new construction adds a long-lasting element to the metropolitan physical environment. Yet, each house and store must be designed and sold to meet the financial capabilities of the individual who first purchases it. According to the private building process, then, the capabilities of the large number of little home and store buyers set the future for the metropolis.

The industrial metropolis of the early twentieth century was built by a succession of thousands of bargains struck between two parties. On the one side the land owners and developers tried to maximize their profits on the sale of land for houses. On the other side the vast majority of working-class and middle-class home purchasers tried to become home owners without overstraining their limited financial capabilities. The only constraints on the bargaining between the two groups in the 1920's were the building and banking laws and the housing customs of the city. The building law of Philadelphia merely legislated what were long-ago minimal standards for structural safety, sanitation, and light and air. The banking laws of Pennsylvania allowed building and loan associations to lend money on both first and second mortgages, so that in Philadelphia one could attempt home ownership with almost no down-payment.

In the twenties many Philadelphians made the attempt at home ownership. In 1930 more than half the city's families owned their own houses for the first time in the city's history. The effort, however, proved more than many could sustain, and by World War II the Great Depression had re-

12. The Regional Plan, 378-412.

duced home ownership to just below the level of 1920. (13.)

The surge of home ownership in the twenties clearly tells of the aspirations of Philadelphia's working-class and middle-class families. Yet their incomes tell how the building of the metropolis had to be tailored. The important figures for the twenties were: 48.3 percent of all Philadelphia families earned less than $2,000 per year and thus could not enter the new housing market either as purchasers or renters; next, 39.2 percent of Philadelphia's families earned $2,000 to $4,000 per year. These were the customers for mass suburban housing. Two thirds of the residential construction of the twenties was designed, built, and sold for this income range. (14.)

The result-miles and miles of grid streets filled with narrow lots and six-room row houses. These structures varied from their 1880 predecessors only by the addition of a front porch, a tiny front yard, and a basement garage connected to a paved, rear, service alley. Fancy detailing and elaborate brickwork and fixtures dressed up the standard model to give the salesman some talking points. The results were equivalent to six-unit flats, two families, and detached singles then being run up by the thousands all over America. The only unique Philadelphia quality was the continuation of the row-house style in the twentieth century when all other cities save Baltimore had turned to detached dwellings.

The developers of Philadelphia followed the American builder's tradition of giving as much structure as they could. The profit lay in pinching on the land. The new construction of the 1920's, thus, meant a good deal of structure set on a disastrous land plan. Not one of the rules of good design was followed: the grid streets did not make visually or socially coherent communities, the narrow lots destroyed the inherited beauty of the land, the façade of the houses, once all the lots were filled, was ugly and endless, and the land so cramped with structures that no recreation space existed and no space was left for future development of the suburbs. In later years streets could be widened, sewers laid, new schools

13. Philadelphia, Bureau of Building Inspection, The Building Code (January, 1930), 103-104; David T. Rowlands, Two Decades of Building and Loan Associations in Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1940). 24-5; Henry M. Muller, Urban Home Ownership: a socio-Economic Analysis with Emphasis on Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1947), 78.

14. Robert S. Glover, Jr., A Survey of the Housing Situation in Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania Master's Thesis, based on the Philadelphia Housing Association's materials, 1933, deposited at School of Fine Arts Library),64-7.

erected, stores and offices and factories moved into the area only with the greatest difficulty and expense. Because the land was so crowded with structures at one moment in time, modernization could only be achieved by the enormously cumbersome, disruptive, and expensive method of urban renewal. The painful irony of the private building process was that at the very moment the building was going on developers knew how to build better, and their customers aspired to more.

In the early twentieth century Philadelphia nourished some of the nation's best examples of suburban design. Local architects had carried out a very successful revival of historical English and colonial American styles and they had worked out a very attractive free style using local stone and traditional design elements. In the expensive sections of the city, and on the Main Line, there stood a full range of good architecture, well suited for mass adaptation. There were small Tudor and colonial detached houses of brick and stone, groupings of English "cottages," arranged in forms which would later be imitated by post-World War II garden apartments, and there was even a fine example of a high-rise apartment house in Germantown next to the city park (foot of McCallum street). Architectural magazines and writers of the period featured such work, and it has been imitated widely in expensive building ever since. (15.)

The private real estate market was so organized that it had no way to join this architectural design skill to the mass demand for housing. Radburns and French Villages cost more than grid streets of row houses; especially they cost the profit on the land. In the twenties the developer's profit could only be maximized at the expense of building a substandard new city. The substandard habit persists to this very day.

15. Examples of Philadelphia styles which could have been adapted for mass suburbs, George H. Edgell, The American Architecture of To-day (New York, 1928), 98-101, 113-119; A. Lawrence Kocher, "The Country House, Are We Developing an American Style?" Architectural Record, LX (November, 1926), 388, 403-417. A discussion of alternatives to the row house and street grid site design, especially based on lessons of the U.S. Housing Corporation's World War I designs, Frank C. Brown, "Low Rental Housing," Architectural Record, LXV (May, 1924), 405-415, LXVI (September, 1924), 206-212, LXVI (October, 1924), 353-367.

Thus the industrial metropolis passed on its legacy of building failure. Vast public effort has been expended in modernizing the downtown at the very moment when the city of the next century was being built below the capabilities of contemporary knowledge and standards. This destructive tradition could only have been overcome if Philadelphia had imitated contemporary European cities, set up its own land development and housing institutions, and used the profit it would realize on land at the growing edge of the city to build for the mass of Philadelphians according to the best standards of the day. The traditions of privatism, however, forbade the city to take the measures necessary to control its own growth. According to the tradition of the private city the municipality could rehabilitate by transit, park, street, and school investments what had already been built, but it could not become an entrepreneur to its own right, no matter what the later public costs of the private real estate market might be.

PRIVATISM AND POLITICAL FAILURE

In the end the failure of the industrial metropolis was political. Although much of urban life is inescapably public the genius of Philadelphia in the 1920's lay not in its public institutions but in its containment of masses of people in thousands of private settings. The single-generation family, the private company's work group, and the income-segregated neighborhood were the metropolis' basic units, and they were the secret of its productivity and social peace. These same units, however, when they confronted the traditional forms of American municipal politics did not produce a creative competition...

B. Reciprocity Among Neighbors

Obviously, individual neighborhoods have found ways to overcome some of the privatism described by Dr. Warner as the ethic of the city as a whole. In fact, without some measure of reciprocity, citizens would eat one another alive. While a few neighborhoods do begin to degenerate this seriously, most adopt informal standards of mutuality and give-and-take. Dr. Suzanne Keller of Princeton University describes some of the patterns in this selection from The Urban Neighborhood.

C. The Issues of Reciprocity

Dr. Keller's comments should suggest to community activists the importance of becoming familiar with issues of reciprocity in the neighborhoods, even if they have never used the term. There are issues of reciprocity between the residents of the neighborhood, between the residents of the neighborhood and private economic institutions, and between residents of the neighborhood and government. A word on each sort of issue is appropriate.

Issues of reciprocity between neighborhood residents are those that revolve around standards of community behavior and cleanliness. Most homeowners keep their property clean; they expect all to do so. Most residents of a block turn their radios and televison sets down when somebody complains; they expect everyone to do so. Most residents respect the condition of public property in the community; they expect their neighbors to do likewise. Most pet-owners try to see that their block doesn't go to the dogs in one way or another. All residents are asked to keep their animals in line. Moreover, people in neighborhoods expect parents to instill in their children the same value of reciprocity that they expect from one

another. When these implicit standards of give-and-take break down, then residents begin to talk about the neighborhood's "going downhill." They begin to talk about moving out.

Issues of reciprocity between the neighborhood and industry most often relate to the environmental and economic character of a neighborhood. When citizens demand that a company develop a filter system to block the smoke pouring out of its smokestacks, they are demanding reciprocity. When a neighborhood opposes zoning variances for an industrial park that will destroy the residental character of the neighborhood, it is raising the issue of reciprocity. Alternatively, when businesses in a community expect decent treatment for workers on their way to work, or the safety of their stores from vandalism and burglars, they are expecting reciprocity for their contribution to the area. Many of the most controversial community issues in recent years--redlining of neighborhoods by banks; utility hikes by utility companies; expressways that threaten to destroy neighborhoods in the name of regional economy--have been battles, in fact, over the appropriate standard of reciprocity between the corporate institutions of a city and the people who live in its neighborhoods.

Reciprocity, finally, is what people expect from government at all levels. Indeed, when Americans say that government has permitted or perpetrated an injustice, they usually are using the concept of reciprocity. Perhaps homes in one area of a city are assessed at 65% of market value, while homes in a richer area are assessed at only 30%. Or maybe large industries receive zoning variances for lavish projects with ease, while community residents must struggle to rehabilitate abandoned homes. The richest areas of town might receive the best services, while other areas are ignored. Friends of a mayor may get not only patronage, but all the pork barrel, while the districts of opponents are ignored altogether. These all become hot political issues. We expect reciprocity from our elected officials; and when we don't receive it, many of us turn off to politics altogether. This is how the principle of reciprocity operates in the political realm.

An intensive discussion of ways to achieve reciprocity in neighborhoods is beyond our scope in this session. We are aiming at defining the issues and how neighborhood residents might respond to them. In this spirit, however, it might be useful to examine a few rules recommended for establishing reciprocity in different situations. Do these rules make sense to you? Would your own neighbors disagree with them? Why, or why not? We can often come to grips with our own standards of reciprocity by responding to principles designed to deal with specific areas of potential conflict.

First, examine these "Neighborhood Courtesy Guidelines" developed by the Independence Councils in Independence, Mo. as a code of conduct for all residents in their community:

"1.) All residents shall maintain the yard, landscaping and exterior of their living units in presentable fashion and in keeping with other living units in the area.

"2.) All residents shall not leave defective cars or trucks or any other unsightly equipment parked for extended periods of time on their property or the street.

"3.) All residents shall not allow noises from activity to disturb their neighbors, especially during the hours from 10:00 P.M. to 8:00 A.M..

"4.) All residents shall not allow smoke or other odors that will disturb others to emanate from their property.

"5.) All residents shall not allow pets to run loose in the neighborhood.

"6.) All residents shall try to be considerate of their neighbors and try not to do anything that would be bothersome to them or detrimental to their neighborhood." (1.)

Are these rules complete? What might you add? Are these rules that would be difficult to enforce in your neighborhood? Which ones? What would the young people of the neighborhood say about these rules? Would they agree to them? Would they demand anything in return from the neighbors? Try to develop a list of guidelines that you think would work in your neighborhood.

Now consider neighborhood-corporation relations. In 1960, William H. Form and Delbert C. Miller outlined both industry's expectations of a community and the community's expectations of industry. Here, without elaboration, are both lists, as reprinted in "Industry, Labor and Community," by Drs. Form and Miller, in Roland L. Warren's Perspectives on the American Community:

Operating Concerns of Established Industry Toward the Community

1.) Obtaining and maintaining services which are essential for the economic operation of the company.

2.) Obtaining and retaining a group of employees who are technically competent and loyal toward the company.

3.) Securing representation in community agencies so that the company can participate in determining future community action toward it.

4.) Maintaining community good will or acceptance.

5.) Encouraging the growth of local facilities harmonious with company and employee aspirations.

Community Demands on Unions and Management

"Community organizations and leaders rarely ask themselves whether the community deserves to survive...Thus they pressure industries to provide stable employment, adequate wage levels, and increasing employment opportunities."

"An important goal of the community is industrial peace, because everyone suffers from prolonged conflict...Many kinds of pressure are put on labor and industrial leaders to insure industrial peace."

"While communities are often willing to make sacrifices for economic stability, they also exert pressure on industry to pay its own way for municipal services."

"The skills of business and labor officials are needed to operate such community agencies as the planning, commission, city council, council of social agencies, youth agencies, and the churches. These agencies must solicit support from industry and labor and yet must not become submissive to them."

"All citizens have some ideas of what constitutes a good community. Cities are commonly evaluated as being healthy or unhealthy, good or bad places to raise children, and as having good or poor institutional facilities...Industry is expected to support the achievement of these community goals." (2.)

Do these standards seem fair standards of reciprocity? Would you add to them? Would you say that the community makes an effort to fulfill the expectations of industry? Does industry fulfill these expectations of the community? Where are the strongest points of agreement? Where are the weakest points?

Yet the critical task lies in developing a philosophy of citizenship that promotes neighborhoods in their government. A simple set of rules cannot establish this relationship. A common commitment to justice, the subject of our last four chapters, is the essential ingrediant.

In the 19th Century however, Alexis de Tocqueville argued that Americans approached this commitment through the concept of "Self-Interest, Rightly Understood." His discussion is as brilliant an analysis of the ethic of civic reciprocity as exists anywhere, and we end the chapter with it. See if you think that it applies to America today.

How the Americans Combat Individualism by the Principle of Self-Interest Rightly Understood

Alexis de Tocqueville *

When the world was managed by a few rich and powerful individuals, these persons loved to entertain a lofty idea of the duties of man. They were fond of professing that it is praiseworthy to forget oneself and that good should be done without hope of reward, as it is by the Deity himself. Such were the standard opinions of that time in morals.

I doubt whether men were more virtuous in aristocratic ages than in others, but they were incessantly talking of the beauties of virtue, and its utility was only studied in secret. But since the imagination takes less lofty flights, and every man's thoughts are centered in himself, moralists are alarmed by this idea of self-sacrifice and they no longer venture to present it to the human mind. They therefore content themselves with inquiring whether the personal advantage of each member of the community does not consist in working for the good of all; and when they have hit upon some point on which private interest and public interest meet and amalgamate, they are eager to bring it into notice. Observations of this kind are gradually multiplied; what was only a single remark becomes a general principle, and it is held as a truth that man serves himself in serving his fellow creatures and that his private interest is to do good.

I have already shown, in several parts of this work, by what means the inhabitants of the United States almost always manage to combine their own advantage with that of their fellow citizens; my present purpose is to point out the general rule that enables them to do so. In the United States hardly anybody talks of the beauty of virtue, but they maintain that virtue is useful and prove it every day. The American moralists do not profess that men ought to sacrifice themselves for their fellow creatures because

*Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville, Volume 2, Second Book, Chapter VIII.

it is noble to make such sacrifices, but they boldly aver that such sacrifices are as necessary to him who imposes them upon himself as to him for whose sake they are made.

They have found out that, in their country and their age, man is brought home to himself by an irresistible force; and, losing all hope of stopping that force, they turn all their thoughts to the direction of it. They therefore do not deny that every man may follow his own interest, but they endeavor to prove that it is the interest of every man to be virtuous. I shall not here enter into the reasons they allege, which would divert me from my subject; suffice it to say that they have convinced their fellow countrymen.

Montaigne said long ago: "Were I not to follow the straight road for its straightness, I should follow it for having found by experience that in the end it is commonly the happiest and most useful track." The doctrine of interest rightly understood is not then new, but among the Americans of our time it finds universal acceptance; it has become popular there; you may trace it at the bottom of all their actions, you will remark it in all they say. It is as often asserted by the poor man as by the rich. In Europe the principle of interest is much grosser than it is in America, but it is also less common and especially it is less avowed; among us, men still constantly feign great abnegations which they no longer feel.

The Americans, on the other hand, are fond of explaining almost all the actions of their lives by the principle of self-interest rightly understood; they show with complacency how an enlightened regard for themselves constantly prompts them to assist one another and inclines them willingly to sacrifice a portion of their time and property to the welfare of the state. In this respect I think they frequently fail to do themselves justice; for in the United States as well as elsewhere people are sometimes seen to give way to those disinterested and spontaneous impulses that are natural to man; but the Americans seldom admit that they yield to emotions of this kind; they are more anxious to do honor to their philosophy than to themselves.

I might here pause without attempting to pass a judgement on what I have described. The extreme difficulty of the subject would be my excuse, but I shall not avail myself of it, and I had rather

that my readers, clearly perceiving my object, would refuse to follow me than that I should leave them in suspense.

The principle of self-interest rightly understood is not a lofty one, but it is clear and sure. It does not aim at mighty objects, but attains without exertion all those at which it aims. As it lies within the reach of all capacities, everyone can without difficulty learn and retain it. By its admirable conformity to human weaknesses it easily obtains great dominion; nor is that dominion precarious, since the principle checks one personal interest by another, and uses, to direct the passions, the very same instrument that excites them.

The principle of self-interest rightly understood produces no great acts of self-sacrifice, but it suggests daily small acts of self-denial. By itself it cannot suffice to make a man virtuous; but it disciplines a number of persons in habits of regularity, temperance, moderation, foresight, self-command; and if it does not lead men straight to virtue by the will, it gradually draws them in that direction by their habits. If the principle of interest rightly understood were to sway the whole moral world, extraordinary virtues would doubtless be more rare; but I think that gross depravity would then also be less common. The principle of interest rightly understood perhaps prevents men from rising far above the level of mankind, but a great number of other men, who were falling far below it, are caught and restrained by it. Observe some few individuals, they are lowered by it; survey mankind, they are raised.

I am not afraid to say that the principle of self-interest rightly understood appears to me the best suited of all philosophical theories to the wants of the men of our time, and that I regard it as their chief remaining security against themselves. Towards it, therefore, the minds of the moralists of our age should turn; even should they judge it to be incomplete, it must nevertheless be adopted as necessary.

I do not think, on the whole, that there is more selfishness among us than in America; the only difference is that there it is enlightened, here it is not. Each American knows when to sacrifice some of his private interests to save the rest: we tend to save everything, and often we lose it all. Everybody I see about me seems bent on teaching his contemporaries by precept and example, that what is useful is never wrong.

> Will nobody undertake to make them understand how what is right may be useful?
>
> No power on earth can prevent the increasing equality of conditions from inclining the human mind to seek out what is useful or from leading every member of the community to be wrapped up in himself. It must therefore be expected that personal interest will become more than ever the principal if not the sole spring of men's actions; but it remains to be seen how each man will understand his personal interest. If the members of a community, as they become more equal, become more ignorant and coarse, it is difficult to foresee to what pitch of stupid excesses their selfishness may lead them; and no one can foretell into what disgrace and wretchedness they would plunge themselves lest they should have to sacrifice something of their own well-being to the prosperity of their fellow creatures.
>
> I do not think that the system of self interest as it is professed in America is in all its parts self-evident, but it contains a great number of truths so evident that men, if they are only educated, cannot fail to see them. Educate, then, at any rate, for the age of implicit self-sacrifice and instinctive virtues is already flitting far away from us, and the time is fast approaching when freedom, public peace, and social order itself will not be able to exist without education.

Footnotes

1. Joe Falk, editor, Cooperative Community Development, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, Future Associates, Inc., 1975, p. 178.

2. William H. Form & Delbert C. Miller, Industry, Labor, and Community; in Roland Warren, editor, Perspectives on the American Community (Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966) pp. 239-251

D. Questions for Discussion

1. Using three separate discussions of reciprocity--between residents, between residents and industry, and betwee residents and government--develop your own social contract for reciprocity in a neighborhood. How difficult would it be to gain acceptance for this contract in the neighborhood? Why or why not?

2. Who would be the main supporters of your reciprocity contract (s)? Why? Who would oppose it? Why?

3. Now consider the following arguments made by people or institutions in the city. Do you think they are fair standards of reciprocity?

   -Young people will not give up gang activity and crime until we can guarantee them a decent education and a job.

   -Industry will not remain in a city unless we insure that corporations get strong tax advantages from local government.

   -Politicians will always reward their friends and ignore their opponents.

4. In general, what are the strongest areas of reciprocity in your neighborhood? What are the weakest? Of the weak areas, which do you think that a community association could handle if it asked the neighbors to take more seriously the principles that are being violated by one or more groups within it? Which principles would be difficult to establish? How could you go about dealing with these?

E. For Further Reading

The Private City. Sam Bass Warner, Jr., Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

The Urban Neighborhood. Suzanne Keller, New York, Random House, 1968.

The Death and Life of Great American Cities. Jane Jacobs, New York, Random House, 1961.

Philadelphia: Neighborhood Authority, and the Urban Crisis. Conrad Weiler, New York, Praeger, 1974.

Governing the City. Gerald Einward, Editor, New York, Pocket Book, 1971.

UNIT IV: THE VALUE OF FELLOWSHIP

A. The Spirit of Fellowship

Fellowship, our third basic community value, is what people usually mean by a "spirit of community," a sense of belonging and friendliness that we imagine the healthiest urban neighborhoods to have developed. Unfortunately, many neighborhood activists assume that fellowship is something that can be wished into existence merely by calling for it, or by holding one or two fairs and Christmas parties. The moment everyone in a neighborhood is at one place, sharing something--anything--they start making long, sentimental speeches about the wonderful "thing" that has been "created here today." No doubt, something does happen at periodic social events that contributes to the fellowship in a neighborhood. Without a continuing effort to cultivate common values, however, this spirit of fellowship hardly survives the events.

Fellowship, comraderie, exists among people who can call themselves friends. Are your neighbors your friends? If they are, then fellowship probably already characterizes the neighborhood, as does reciprocity, security, and the common standard of justice that makes all community possible. If the neighbors are strangers and acquaintances, however--then to talk of fellowship within the neighborhood is premature. Activists must understand why fellowship exists in those communities that claim to have it.

In writing about New England, Alexis de Tocqueville identified two main ingredients of fellowship as "independence" and "authority." Since the New England town has become a model for what we think of as fellowship in America, we should examine how de Tocqueville characterized it.

Spirit of the Townships in New England (1.)

Alexis de Tocqueville*

> In America not only do municipal bodies exist, but they are kept alive and supported by town spirit. The township of New England possesses two advantages which strongly excite the interest of mankind: namely, independence and authority. Its sphere is limited, indeed; but within that sphere its action is unrestrained. This independence alone gives it a real importance, which its extent and population would not ensure.

*Democracy in America, Volume I, Chapter 5.p.64.

It is to be remembered, too, that the affections of men generally turn towards power. Patriotism is not durable in a conquered nation. The New Englander is attached to his township not so much because he was born in it, but because it is a free and strong community, of which he is a member, and which deserves the care spent in managing it. In Europe the absence of local public spirit is a frequent subject of regret to those who are in power; everyone agrees that there is no surer guarantee of order and tranquility, and yet nothing is more difficult to create. If the municipal bodies were made powerful and independent, it is feared that they would become too strong and expose the state to anarchy. Yet without power and independence a town may contain good subjects, but it can have no active citizens. Another important fact is that the township of New England is so constituted as to excite the warmest of human affections without arousing the ambitious passions of the heart of man. The officers of the county are not elected, and their authority is very limited. Even the state is only a second-rate community whose tranquil and obscure administration offers no inducement sufficient to draw men away from the home of their interests into the turmoil of public affairs. The Federal government confers power and honor on the men who conduct it, but these individuals can never be very numerous. The high station of the Presidency can only be reached at an advanced period of life: and the other Federal functionaries of a high class are generally men who have been favored by good luck or have been distinguished in some other career. Such cannot be the permanent aim of the ambitious. But the township, at the center of the ordinary relations of life, serves as a field for the desire of public esteem, the want of exciting interest, and the taste for authority and popularity; and the passions that commonly embroil social change their character when they find a vent so near the domestic hearth of the family circle.

In the American townships power has been distributed with admirable skill, for the purpose of interesting the greatest number of persons in the common weal. Independently of the voters, who are from time to time called into action, the power is divided among innumerable functionaries and officers, who all, in their several spheres, represent the powerful community in whose name they act. The local administration thus affords an unfailing source of profit and interest to a vast number of individuals.

The American system, which divides the local authority among so many citizens, does not scruple to multiply the functions of the town officers. For in the United States, it is believed, and with truth, that patriotism is a kind of devotion which is strengthened by ritual observance. In this manner the activity of the township is continually perceptible; it is daily manifested in the fulfillment of a duty or the exercise of a right; and a constant though gentle motion is thus kept up in society, which animates without disturbing it. The American attaches himself to his little community for the same reason that the mountaineer clings to his hills, because the characteristic features of his country are there more distinctly marked; it has a more striking physiognomy.

The existence of the townships of New England, is in general, a happy one. Their government is suited to their tastes, and chosen by themselves. In the midst of the profound peace and general comfort that reign in America, the commotions of municipal life are infrequent. The conduct of local business is easy. The political education of the people has long been complete; say rather that it was complete when the people first set foot upon the soil. In New England no tradition exists of a distinction of rank; no portion of the community is tempted to oppress the remainder; and the wrongs that may injure isolated individuals are forgotten in the general contentment that prevails. If the government has faults (and it would no doubt be easy to point out some), they do not attract notice, for the government really emanates from those it governs, and whether it acts ill or well, this fact casts the protecting spell of a parental pride over its demerits. Besides, they have nothing wherewith to compare it. England formerly governed the mass of the colonies; but the people was always sovereign in the township, where the rule is not only as ancient, but a primitive state.

The native of New England is attached to his township, because it is independent and free: his co-operation in its affairs ensures his attachment to its interests; the well-being it affords him secures his affection; and its welfare is the aim of his ambition and of his future exertions. He takes a part in every occurence in the place; he practices the art of government in the small sphere within his reach; he accustoms himself to those forms without which liberty can only advance by revolutions; he imbibes their spirit; he acquires a taste for order, comprehends the balance of powers, and collects clear practical notions on the nature of his duties and the extent of his rights.

B. The Fellowship of the Church

In urban neighborhoods, a church or synagogue often operates as the main institution to establish fellowship in the community. Writing about the Jewish ghetto of Chicago in the early 1920's, Lewis Wirth observed that, "The synagogue is the central institution in the whole community. It usually has its rabbi, who visits the homes of the members and advises them in their domestic and business problems...Through the synagogue the members come into touch with important events of concern to them, and the synagogue still remains the effective organ of approach to the ghetto community." (2.)

Father Andrew Greeley makes a similar point about the role of the Catholic Church in Irish neighborhoods:

> The parish was...a symbol of loyalty around which the immigrants and their children and grandchildren would rally in a society that was at first hostile and then not especially friendly. For many of us, it is no exaggeration to say that the parish was the center of our lives; it provided us with education, recreation, entertainment, friendships, and potential spouses. It was a place to belong. When asked where we came from, we named the parish rather than the street or neighborhood. (3.)

In the past fifteen years, many Americans have also learned about the critical role that churches play in promoting fellowship in black neighborhoods. As the following selection suggests, strong churches have existed in these neighborhoods for years. Black Metropolis, by St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Clayton, first appeared in 1945.

Religion and the Church (4.)

by St. Clair Drake and Horace Clayton*

> There are about 500 policy stations in Bronzeville, 80 poolrooms, 200 taverns, and scores of buffet-flats and dives. But there are also about 500 churches, at least 300 of these being located in definitely lower-class neighborhoods. The evening hours of Bronzeville's lower-class areas are noisy with the cacophony of both hymns and blues, gospel songs and "low-down" music. It is obvious that some people in Bronzeville take their pleasure by "making a joyful noise unto the Lord." This complex that we have just described is to them "The World of Sin," and they claim to live "in it, but not of it."

*From Black Metropolis, See P. 84

The church-oriented segment of the lower class is important because it represents an element of stability in a disordered milieu. The church world is a women's world, for less than a third of the lower-class church members are men. These lower-class church women are, on the whole, an influence for stable family relations within their social strata. As they phrase it, they are often "unequally yoked together" with men who are "sinners" and whose "sin" is reflected in a devotion to gambling, extra-marital sex relations, and "big-timing." "Respectable lowers"-male and female-are usually "church people," but they are a decided minority within the large lower class. The Negro "dicties" and the larger white world view lower-class religion with amused condescension. To some lower-class people, however, identification with the church is considered the "better" alternative of a forced option: complete personal disorganization or "serving the Lord." But, as we shall see later, certain secular organizations such as the labor unions and radical political sects have recently begun to pull a segment of the lower class into their orbits.

Slightly over half of Bronzeville's 100,000 lower-class adults claim to be church members. The majority of these identify themselves with the Baptist or Methodist denominations, and are therefore nominally committed to opposing gambling, card-playing, dancing, drinking, fornication, and similar derelictions. A small proportion of the lower-class church group claims membership in a score of other denominations, each having its own distinctive doctrinal emphasis. Although about half of the lower class claims church membership, a careful analysis of church records indicates that fewer than a third of the lower-class adults were actually dues-paying members of any church on the eve of the Second World War. An ever smaller number organized the greater part of their leisure time and the emotional life around the church and religion.

It has been estimated that of the approximately 30,000 lower-class persons who were actually affiliated with churches, about a sixth belonged to three very large lower-class churches (each having more than 1,500 members); another sixth were distributed among a score of medium-sized lower-class churches (each with 200 to 500 members); about one-third of the total group were worshiping in remodeled stores, garages, theatres, houses, and halls; and another third were members of churches

in which higher-status members predominated. Lower-class neighborhoods were plentifully supplied with small Baptist and Holiness churches.

Old Wine in New Bottles: The prevailing attitude of Bronzeville's lower-class church people is expressed in an old spiritual: "Gimme that old-time religion, it's good enough for me." Drawn into the Baptist and Methodist evangelical tradition by white missionaries during and immediately after slavery, Negroes have preserved on a large scale the religious behavior which was prevalent on the American frontier between 1800 and 1890. Since, however, the Negro church has evolved in isolation from the white church, certain distinctive modifications and colorations have grown up which give Negro religious services a flavor all their own.

The fountainhead of the old-time religion is the rural South-the Bible Belt. Urban life puts its stamp on this religion, and while the basic features of the old beliefs and rituals persist in Bronzeville they have been modified by contact with the complexities of a large northern city. "Sin," and the "Devil" too, are wilier adversaries in Chicago than in the less complicated world of the Deep South.

To most of Bronzeville's lower-class church people, "Sin" is a malevolent reality. It was responsible for Adam's fall. It is the cause of all our present woes, individual and collective. In defining "sin" there is much unanimity on the nature of the major sins, and much disagreement about the minor ones. One preacher at a lower-class revival took as his subject, "Look What Sin Has Done, Let's Get Rid of It." He named as the main derelictions adultery, anger, atheism, cheating, "acting stuck-up," covetousness, "being too critical," deceit, dishonesty, disloyalty, gambling, hypocrisy, "backbiting" and "spasmodic speaking to one another," lack of personal cleanliness, fighting in the home, drunkenness, and "sex immorality."

References to lower-class sex and family behavior are prevalent in sermons delivered before lower-class congregations. The following excerpt from a Sunday sermon in one of Bronzeville's largest churches illustrates the usual attack upon "sinful" family habits:

"Why, the people have lost all self-respect, and most of our children are brought up in homes where there is

strife, anger, and viciousness all the time. Some of you people lie down mad and get up mad. Just cursing and swearing all the time over the children. I sometimes wonder can't you that live that sort of life find a place for Jesus in your homes. That's where to start a remedy, right in your home life. One thing I want to impress upon you-no couple should ever marry that don't have love and respect for each other."

The tone of such a sermon would imply that the pattern of sex and family behavior described in Chapter 20 as typically lower-class is characteristic of "church people" as well as "sinners." Interviews with a score of preachers in intimate contact with the lower class, as well as observation of families affiliated with lower-class churches, seem to indicate that where both heads of a family are "church people" the unit tends to have a pattern similar to that of the middle class. Most of the members of lower-class churches, however, are women married to husbands who are "unchurched" or women who have been deserted or divorced. In the latter case, sexual affairs outside of marraige, while frowned upon, do not ordinarily result in social ostracism so long as they do not involve open scandals or public fights. The influence of the church on lower-class sex and family life seems to be confined to moderating public brawling and to creating a group of women who try to make their children "respectable" and encourage them to assume a middle-class family pattern even though they themselves, due to "weakness of the flesh" or bitter experiences with men, do not maintain stable family relations. Children of such families are often torn between affection for a parent and contempt or disgust for the family behavior pattern. It is probable that juvenile delinquency is closely related to such conflicts. There are, of course, numerous lower-class women whose lives are so completely organized around the church and religion or middle-class ideology that sexual "delinquency" would never occur.

The pattern of lower-class family life thus finds its reflection in one definition which lower-class ministers give of "Sin." Most of them also include diatribes against card-playing and dancing, attendance at movies and baseball games on Sunday, and "putting the 'world' before Christ." A few denounce all forms of athletics.

Lower-class theology is Fundamentalist. The preachers paint a vivid picture of a stern Father "who gave His only begotten Son to save a sin-sick world!" They call

upon sinners to seek salvation through the "Four-square Gospel"-confession, repentance, regeneration, and sanctification. They preach justification by faith, declaring that a man is not saved because he is good, but will act good because he's saved. Once saved, a Christian may backslide, but he can be "restored to fellowship" by repentance and prayer. The immediate rewards of salvation-the "fruits of the spirit"- are usually described as joy, peace, and "a clear conscience." The ultimate rewards, however, are reserved for Heaven, the final destination of the "saved." Conversion, baptism, and confirmation are assumed to be the high spots in the Christian's life, and the faithful meet periodically at testimonial meetings and prayer meetings to recount the circumstances of their conversion, to detail their "trials and tribulations," and to "tell their determination" to "press on." Preachers, too, sometimes relate the circumstances of their own conversions, as in the case of one Baptist minister who exhorted his congregation to "inquire about the path and follow it." He told them that "a long time ago, down in Arkansas, I found the path and I've tried to walk in it ever since. I've made mistakes just like anybody else, but I'm trying to keep on the path. God needs clean men!" Allusions to a conversion "back South" are common in testimonials, with some such statement as: "I know some of us found 'it' out down South after praying all night long. I got 'it' in Louisiana and am satisfied that I am saved by the blood of Jesus."

Prodigal Sons and Daughters: Most of Bronzeville's adults and a large proportion of the children have been exposed to the general outline of this theological scheme and are familiar with the ritual requirements for salvation. Almost half of the adults claim to have been "converted" and immersed as Baptists. A very large proportion of them are "backsliders." Nevertheless, they (and many of the "sinners" too) continue to accept the church's estimate of their status as apostate or unsaved. Bronzeville's lower class seems to carry a heavy load of deeply buried guilt feelings. In Bronzeville's buffet-flats and dives it is not unusual to hear proprietors and patrons alike reminiscing when a religious song is sung on the radio-about their "Christian mothers" or their own religious experiences when young. The very vehemence with which these prodigal children sometimes denounce the preachers and "the church folks" reveals a latent uneasiness.

Bronzeville's lower class generally recognizes an area of the sacred and profane, a dichotomy evidenced by the comment of one tough woman: "My sister goes to the Holiness church. She's good. I went down there to her church once drunk and the usher put me out. I shouldna done that."

But the acids of modernity are at work in Bronzeville as they are everywhere. Skepticism about the truth of the saga of salvation is general. Mistrust of the motives of the professional religionists is widespread. Often hungry and beset by family troubles, discriminated against by white people and more affluent Negroes, Bronzeville's lower class, during the Depression years, entertained serious doubts of either the necessity or the efficacy of religion. They demanded results in the "here and now" rather than in "the sweet by-and-by."

In the country and small towns of the South, the church and the preacher are often influential and powerful. In the city, the average preacher is shorn of his power. Except for one or two influential ministers, Bronzeville's preachers are not in a position to secure jobs, legal favors, and similar gains for their constituencies. The precinct captain or alderman tends to replace the preacher as the key person in time of crisis. It does not take long for a migrant Negro to recognize the wielders of power in the city; to discover who can secure relief for him; who can get him out of jail; or who can find him a job. (One does not even need a preacher for burila or marriage, and Baptist children, at least, do not need to be christened-it's "unscriptural.") Deprived of his power in this fashion, the minister is in a very precarious position indeed, and such criticisms as the following are common among lower-class persons. The first speaker is a church member; the second and third are not.

"There are too many churches in colored neighborhoods anyhow. What we need is something to put people to work."

"It's nice to have religion, and it's nice to go to church. But you've got to look after self first. Most of our people have got their minds too deep on religion and let everything else get away from them. If they'd stop so much religion and do a little more thinking, it would be better for us all. As far as I can see, half of these preachers ain't right. <u>They</u> do everything they're big enough to do, then expect <u>you</u> to live holy. I don't believe half of them."

"Religion's a lot of bunk."

Even those who believe that "God will reward the righteous according to his deeds" are quick to say: "I can be saved if I live right. I don't need to go to church and give no preacher my money," and for the backsliders there is always the old Baptist doctrine to comfort them: "Once in Christ you're never out" (i.e. if you have once been converted and baptized, nothing you do afterwards is really fatal). Despite repeated clerical warning that "you can't count on a deathbed repentance," plenty of Bronzeville's people are willing to take the chance.

C. The Crisis of Fellowship

What happens in neighborhoods without one, central church or synagogue that everyone attends? The answer is that without an alternative center for cultivating common values--nothing happens. In previous years, the political parties--most often the Democratic Party in the cities--created common loyalties where common religious or ethnic bonds did not exist. To be sure, local party organizations often tried to reflect, rather than erase, ethnic diversity within their organizations, for sound moral and political reasons. Yet the process of a local clubhouse, that engaged people in a continuing effort to control local and national government, that involved party workers and voters in periodic social activities, that responded to the daily needs of party constituents, all served to strengthen the relationships among people within the neighborhood as well.

From this perspective, it is not hard to understand why neighborhood communities are losing their sense of fellowship today; and why those that still have it feel deeply threatened by the slightest suggestion of change. The pressures of modern economic life have eroded common faith in both religious and local political institutions. Indeed, many liberal reforms--Civil Service, for example--have destroyed party organizations at the local level without creating adequate centers for community in their place. Advocates of these reforms have assumed fellowship to be a "natural" instinct in human beings, requiring little institutional reinforcement. Sometimes, reformers have felt threatened by strong local communities, feeling that communal standards and values are somehow at odds with a sense of personal freedom. The result has been the development of liberal institutions and liberal political programs that have done virtually nothing to preserve communal institutions or the fellowship that has emerged from them.

Yet those who would now recreate fellowship in a vacuum must approach the problem with the recognition of how difficult it is. Most religions evolve over centuries. Political parties in the United States date back to Thomas Jefferson's administration. Cultivating the traditional loyalties that these institutions possess isn't going to happen overnight. As a starting point, the activist must ask what the basic possibilities for fellowship are.

First, are the people in the neighborhood even interested in promoting fellowship with one another? If they aren't, then trying to create it is going to be rather difficult. There are many neighborhoods where most people would just as soon be left

alone, or whose sense of communal responsibility with neighbors would extend only to reciprocity. The activist must determine first where the neighbors would extend only to reciprocity. The activist must determine first where the neighbors stand on this question. The conclusion might be that efforts to create fellowship should await common activity on a range of security, or reciprocity issues, before trying directly to promote fellowship among the neighbors themselves.

A second question to ask in whether there is fellowship among some groups within the neighborhood. Senior citizens may belong to neighborhood senior citizens' clubs. Even when churches do not involve an entire neighborhood, they may involve sub-groups within it. Friendships may revolve around recreation programs, around child-care centers, around political clubhouses. These centers of fellowship may provide a social base from which broader social cohesion can be developed.

Third, are there problems of security and reciprocity which can be dealt with only if a measure of fellowship is achieved among the residents of a neighborhood? Obviously, it would be impossible to solve an issue of noise or pets between two neighbors who despised one another. Why would they care what each other thought? Indeed, neighbors have to take a chance on liking one another before even attending a neighborhood meeting. For this reason, an activist probably should not raise the most sensitive issues in a neighborhood until the neighbors know one another well enough to handle them. Most people follow this rule in developing other relationships that are important to them. Neighborhood relationships are no different.

Finally, the activist should figure out what kind of activities might create fellowship among the neighbors. Every community isn't equally excited by fairs, Christmas Parties, and dances. Some might prefer kite-flies, picnics, or tennis leagues. Perhaps a neighborhood talent show would bring people together, or a neighborhood art show. Or even some sort of neighborhood discussion series. There are no sure-fire answers to these questions. Neighborhood activists must feel them out for themselves, and expect to make many mistakes. Cultivating fellowship is as delicate a problem as cultivating friendship. Unless it is approached with great caution and skill, the activist may end up in the center of squabbles and fights, rather than among friends. A Beatles song talks about "getting by with a little help from our friends." Perhaps the first step is persuading the neighbors that they can't get by without them.

Footnotes

1. Alexis de Tocqueville, see P. 73.

2. Lewis Wirth, The Ghetto, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 207-9.

3. Andrew Greeley, That Most Distressful Nation: The Taming of the American Irish, (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1972), p. 87.

4. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Clayton, Black Metropolis, Vol. I., (New York: Harper Torch Books, 1948), pp. 611-618) By permission of the publisher.

C. Questions for Discussion

1. In general, would you say that your neighborhood is characterized by fellowship? Why or why not?

2. Are there groups within your neighborhood who share the value of fellowship? On what basis--religious; ethnic; age (senior citizens, young people); political? Do these groups participate in broad neighborhood activities, or do they keep to themselves?

3. Are there institutions that promote fellowship in the neighborhood? Which ones? How? What is there overall impact on the neighborhood?

4. Do you think that your neighbors would want a program to promote fellowship among them? Why or why not? What kind of program would work best?

D. For Further Reading

The Ghetto. Lewis Wirth,
Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1928.

That Most Distressful Nation: The Taming of the American Irish. Andrew Greeley,
Chicago, Quadrangle, 1972.

Black Metropolis. 2 Volumes. St. Clair Drake and Horace Clayton,
New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1948.

The Urban Village. Herbert Gans,
New York, Free Press, 1962.

The Peoples of Philadelphia. Allen F. Davis and Mark H. Haller,
Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1973.

UNIT V: THE IDEAL OF JUSTICE

A. The Relevance of Justice

As we argued at the outset, the capacity to develop common standards of security, reciprocity and fellowship depends on a common principle of justice. Even the ways in which citizens define their problems reflects their view of what justice requires. When asked about neighborhood security in a diverse neighborhood, for example, some residents will complain about housebreaking, while others will focus on police brutality. In the area of reciprocity, homeowners might complain about the failure of banks to give conventional mortgages in their neighborhood, while the bankers complain that the homeowners aren't doing enough to prevent vandalism and street crime. In promoting fellowship, an activist may discover that while some people are anxious to get the community together, others want to be left alone. These are a few examples of how different standards of justice can dictate not merely the solutions to problems, but the way in which we define them.

For this reason, it is quite important for a neighborhood activist to understand what the competing standards of justice are. By definition, building community is a process of helping citizens identify common goals around which they can unite. Since our ability to come to such agreements depends upon a shared sense of justice, an activist without an understanding of the concept will never be able to relate to people at this level.

A familiar neighborhood situation will emphasize the point. A person decides to organize a block with several elderly residents living alongside families with young people between 14 and 20. Going door to door, he or she discovers that many of the senior citizens are upset about housebreakings, while the young people are angry at being hassled by adults just for standing on street-corners. The organizer calls a meeting. He or she asks everyone to list their complaints. True to form, the senior citizens talk about housebreakings in the past three years. They say that they are terrified to leave their homes, particularly at night. They long for the days when everyone knew and trusted one another. The parents of the young people, in turn, complain that their kids have no jobs; that there are no decent recreation programs; that it is unfair to keep a young person locked up all day. They insist that it is not their children who are robbing houses.

The organizer first tries to persuade each side to join in a common campaign for the demands of the other--that is, he or she asks them to join in a common campaign for safe streets for older people and jobs for youth. While both groups agree in principle to the coalition, neither shows much enthusiasm for it.

Consistent with the social contract technique, the organizer tries to obtain agreement to a Neighborhood Security Contract stipulating that all will work for neighborhood safety, even to the point of offering information to the block and to the police about suspected housebreakers in the neighborhood. While the older residents sign right away, the young people--particularly those who have such information--refuse. They argue that the community is doing nothing for them, so why should they start acting as undercover agents for the community? Even though they're not housebreaking themselves, why should they get people they know in trouble?

At this point, the organizer would have no way out of the dilemma unless he or she could generate a discussion in the neighborhood on appropriate common standards of justice. What do senior citizens have a right to expect from their neighbors? What do young people have a right to expect? How much do the people of a neighborhood owe one another? How much protection do they deserve from one another? These are all issues to which the organizer would have to respond. Most important, the standards of justice presented in such a dialogue--concerning responsibility, obligation, mutual respect--would reflect principles of justice determined within society as a whole. Unless the activist were familiar with these principles, he or she would find it difficult to get beyond the conflicts to the more important goals around which the neighbors should unite. Indeed, without an ability to appeal to higher--and perhaps more deeply felt--common values among the neighbors, the organizer might end up reinforcing the conflicts between members of the community. Each group would end up even more convinced that the other didn't care about what it thought.

The number of organizing efforts that have met this sorrowful fate should persuade budding activists to take issues of justice quite seriously. Unfortunately, the foolish belief that it is only private interests to which people respond--not common values--has prevented various schools of "professional" organizers from paying much attention to this process. There is almost no written material available that even deals with it. Thus, we offer below a brief summary of the important American traditions of justice, and how they reflect our attitudes toward the communities in which we live.

B. The Traditions of Justice

Within political theory and theology, at least, there have been several efforts to define different standards of justice in America. Reverend Jesse Jackson of Operation PUSH offered a particularly good summary in his July 4th Philadelphia address, "Time to Weld the Bell":

> We think of justice by several definitions. We think of democratic justice--innocent until proven guilty, and we often know people who are condemned without trial.
>
> We speak of proportional justice, of poetic justice, justice with symmetry--you will reap what you sow. Often, we see people sow, but the reaping is so distant that we become disgusted.
>
> We speak of reciprocal justice as an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. That is a barbaric and crude form of justice; for taken to its logical conclusion, we will all be blind and without teeth.
>
> There is another level of justice that we are called to--Divine justice, which has a sacrificial character. The integral concepts imagined in Divine justice are: to whom more is given more is required; mercy (extended favor); grace (unmerited favor); forgiveness (debts that you forego) for renewal. The Cross represents the burden of Divine justice with a sacrificial character. If we are to get well, we must rise above democracy, poetry, proportionality, and reciprocity into the divine realm of sacrificial justice. (1.)

Reverend Jackson's summary suggests three distinct traditions of justice, all of which have had powerful roots in America--a religious tradition, a corporate tradition, and a liberal tradition. From our religious heritage, we have derived the Prophetic or "Divine" conception of justice, enunciated by Reverend Jackson in his speech. Since Alexander Hamilton however, and particularly since the late 19th Century, business leaders have defended a "Gospel of Wealth" that remains the main argument for justice under capitalism to this day. Between them, a liberal conception of justice based on the notion of equality in the Declaration of Independence has attempted to mediate. Each of these traditions deserves consideration.

1. Religious Justice

When most Americans think about justice, religious justice is what first comes to mind. Our earliest origins were religious in nature, and we still have not escaped them. Indeed, the most

powerful formulation of religious idealism in American History appears in the Model of Christian Charity, composed by John Winthrop in 1630 on board the ship Arrabella, as the Puritans headed to what later became known as the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The "Model" was more than a manifesto. It was itself a social contract among the voyagers to the New World, one which viewed the "natural" inequalities of human life as a challenge to cooperate. We reproduce the main arguments here.

Model of Christian Charity
John Winthrop (2.)

God Almighty, in his most holy and wise providence has so disposed of the Condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich, some poor; some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in subjection.

The Reasons:

First...to show forth the glory of His wisdom in the variety and difference of the Creatures and the glory of His power, in ordering all these differences for the preservation and the good of the whole...

Second, that he might have more occasion to manifest the work of the Spirit:first, upon the wicked in moderating and restraining them: so that the rich and mighty should not eat up the poor, nor the poor and despised rise up against their superiors and shake off their yoke...

Third, that every man might have need of other, and from hence they might all knit more nearly together in the Bond of brotherly affection. From hence it appears plainly that no man is made more honorable than another or more wealthy, etc., out of any particular respect to himself, but for the glory of his Creator and the Common good of the Creature, Man...

There are two rules whereby we are to walk towards another: JUSTICE and MERCY. These are always distinguished in their Act and in their object, yet may they both concur in the same Subject in each respect; as sometimes there may be an occasion of showing mercy to a rich man, in some sudden danger of distress, and also doing of mere Justice to a poor man in regard to some particular contract, etc.

There is likewise a double Law by which we are regulated in our conversation, one towards another...By the first of these laws, man as he was enabled so withall is commanded to love his neighbor as himself. Upon this ground stands all the precepts of the moral law, which concerns our dealings with men. To apply this to the works of mercy, this law requires two things: that every man afford his help to another in every want or distress; second, that he perform this out of the same affection, which makes him careful of his own good according to that of our Savior: Matthew (7:12)...When there is no other means whereby our Christian brother may be relieved in

this distress, we must help him beyond our ability, rather than tempt God, in putting him upon help by miraculous or extraordinary means...

1.) For the persons, we are a Company professing ourselves fellow members of Christ...

2.) For the work we have in hand, it is by a mutual consent through a special overruling providence, and more than ordinary approbation of the Churches of Christ to seek out a place of Cohabitation and Courtship under a due form of Government, both civil and ecclesiastical.

3.) The end is to improve our lives and to do more service to the Lord, the comfort and increase of the body of Christ whereof we are members, that ourselves and our posterity may be the better preserved from the Common corruptions of this evil world to serve the Lord and work out our Salvation and under the power and purity of his holy Ordinances.

4.) For the means whereby this end must be effected, they are twofold: a conformity with the work and end we aim at...That which the most in their Churches maintain as a truth in profession only, we must bring into familiar and constant practice--as in this duty of love we must love brotherly without dissimulation; we must love one another fervently; we must bear one another's burdens; we must not look only on our own things, but also on the things of our brethren; neither must we think that the Lord will bear with such failings at our hands as he doth from those among whom we have lived.

Thus stands the cause between God and us, we are entered into Covenant with Him for this work. We have taken out a Commission, the Lord hath given us leave to draw our own Articles. We have professed to enterprise these Actions upon these and these ends. We have therefore besought Him of favor and blessing. Now if the Lord shall please to hear us, and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then hath he ratified this Covenant and sealed our Commission...

As we can see, although the Puritans recognized that "some must be rich, some poor; some high and eminent in power and dignity, others mean and in subjection," they believed that these inequalities of nature imposed a strong obligation on the community to create a cooperative spirit. We should remember as well that the inequalities of 1630 in Massachusetts Bay were nothing like the massive inequalities between rich and poor that we tolerate today. Even modest inequality, however, prompted the Puritans to work for the "ordering" of "all these differences for the preservation and the good of the whole."

2. Corporate Justice

The growing class of merchants in 18th Century America began

to develop their own interpretation of the religious principle, however. If the Puritans had argued that the pursuit of God would lead to success on earth, to America's businessmen, this formula rapidly became, "the pursuit of success will lead to grace in the eyes of God." By the late 19th Century, the proposition had become a new American gospel, a gospel of wealth, with its own standards of justice.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie of U.S. Steel, presents us with its main arguments in an article called "Wealth," that appeared in the North American Review in 1889. A few passages reveal his argument. First, Carnegie tells us why society benefits from a system that permits great inequalities of wealth:

> It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas. The "good old times" were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as today. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both--not the least so to him who serves--and would sweep away civilization with it...
>
> In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly articles were manufactured at the domestic hearth or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions...But the inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. Today the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the generation preceding this would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the farmer had a few generations ago...
>
> The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, in the mine, and in the counting-house of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom the employer is little better than a myth...
>
> The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train... While the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it

> is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. (3.)

Having stated the benefits of concentrated wealth and the "law of competition," Mr. Carnegie turns to the obligations of the wealthy:

> Poor and restricted are the opportunities in this life; narrow are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives...
>
> This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious livng, shunning display or extravagances; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgement, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community--the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer bretheren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves. (4.)

Thus, from these two passages, we can piece together the main points that Andrew Carnegie makes:

> First, that the highest culture of the race depends upon great wealth. Therefore, it is important for society to amass great wealth.
>
> Second, that competition provides an important incentive for individuals to amass the wealth that society needs.
>
> Third, that a competitive system allows the worthiest to rise to the top, in accordance with the law of the survival of the fittest.
>
> Fourth, that even the lowest members of society grow richer under a system that works to produce wealth, because there is much more total wealth. They end up better off, in fact, than they would if government imposed an arbitrary equality between rich and poor that gave no one incentive to produce wealth. In such a system, Carnegie implies everyone would emerge equally poor and miserable.

> Fifth, that the opportunity to amass wealth imposes an obligation upon the rich to use their money for the benefit of those less well endowed and fortunate. Such a system, in fact, is allowing the rich to become "agents and trustees" for their "poorer brethren."

In short, justice is the rule of the fittest in the struggle for economic survival.

We can see how profoundly the "Gospel of Wealth" revises the ideal of religious justice as developed in New England. Indeed, the Puritans would have said that Carnegie was turning God's Law on its head. God created diversity, they insisted, to challenge human beings to cooperate with one another despite their differences. The end of progress was not wealth, not even the arts and literature, but virtue--the "moral law" that a person should "love one another as himself." To the Robber Barons, however, love in the abstract was less important than creating material goods and services for themselves and others. They rejected the religious notion that even greater wealth would not offer much dignity to low-income people under a system that treated the poor as serfs to a few corporate magnates acting as their "trustees." If everyone's private needs were satisfied, they argued, why would anyone care how much money and power rich people possessed?

3. The Role of Government and Liberal Justice

The practical consequence of this debate becomes even clearer when we examine the role of government in the systems defended by the Puritans and Carnegie. The Puritans had envisaged a much tougher role for government than merely creating incentives for service once a few people already acquired massive wealth. The social contract, the covenant, was not with progress, not with material possessions, but with God. The government was "civil and ecclesiastical." The political leaders, then, were to be the spiritual leaders, always forcing the community to define what God's Will required in each stage of political and economic development.

To Carnegie, however, government had two responsibilities: to help individuals accumulate wealth and to encourage them to use it for the good of society. The first responsibility was easy enough to fulfill. Government should merely permit capitalists to acquire as much as they could without interference. Only in the area of charity and distribution was government action appropriate. Believing that the differences in wealth should reflect the differences in talent and not accidents of birth, Carnegie favored severe inheritance taxes. He had contempt for English Kings who bestowed enormous riches upon their children, regardless of their ability. He also felt that strict inheritance taxes would provide incentives for wealthy people to distribute their riches during their life-

times, rather than horde it for their own sons and daughters. This was his concession to the Christian standard of service that he himself shared with his Puritan ancestors.

If Ministers, finally, had to defend their decisions in accordance with "right reason" in interpreting the Bible to the community, "Robber Barons" defended their decisions only in accordance with standards of efficiency, growth, and profit.

Though separated by over 350 years, this debate between corporatism and Puritanism over the role of government presents us with something like the dilemma faced by our Founding Fathers in drafting the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Writing in the 18th Century, they identified the unity between Church and State as a grave threat to human liberty, permitting only one Church, the Anglican Church, to dominate all others. They equally resented public control of the economy, since this system had turned fledgling American industries into mere tax producers for Parliament and the Crown. Yet early Americans hardly rejected God's role in government --our "inalienable rights" were "endowed by the Creator." Nor did they oppose all government intervention in the economy. All early American administrations--Washington's; Adams'; Jefferson's--included strong public involvement in agricultural and manufacturing affairs. The debate was over how government should become involved, not whether it should.

The result, as it evolved, was a liberal compromise--one which left the basic process of competition to the "private sector," but which let government act as something like a referee--controlling the excesses of the rich, while working to insure equal opportunity for each succeeding generation. In 1832, President Andrew Jackson offered the clearest statement of this sort of justice in vetoing a national bank that would have permitted enormous government subsidies to corporations:

> ...Every monopoly and all exclusive privileges are granted at the expense of the public, which ought to receive a fair equivalent. The many millions which this act proposes to bestow on the stockholders of the existing bank must come directly or indirectly out of the earnings of the American people. It is due to them, therefore, if their Government sell monopolies and exclusive privileges, that they should exact for them at least as much as they are worth in open competition.
>
> It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions...but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society--the farmers, mechanics, and laborers--who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its

> evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing. (5.)

As we can see, if religious idealists believed that government should challenge us to fulfill God's Law, while corporatists believed that government should reward the rich for their wealth, President Jackson saw the role of government as guaranteeing equal protection to all elements of society who then could sort out standards of justice among themselves.

This liberal notion of justice as a balance between opposites--rich and poor; powerful and weak; idealist and realist--has had a profound impact on the evolution of both religious and corporate justice in the United States. Alexis de Tocqueville's comments on the subject, made in 1832 in the midst of the Jacksonian era, are worth examining. De Tocqueville recognized that churches deliberately avoided direct political intervention:

> I showed how the American clergy stand aloof from secular affairs. This is the most obvious but not the only example of their self-restraint. In America religion is a distinct sphere, in which the priest is sovereign, but out of which he takes care never to go. Within its limits he is master of the mind; beyond them he leaves men to themselves and surrenders them to the independence and instability that belong to their nature and their age. I have seen no country in which Christianity is clothed with fewer forms, figures, and observances than in the United States, or where it presents more distinct, simple and general notions to the mind. Although the Christians of America are divided into a multitude of sects, they all look upon their religion in the same light. This applies to Roman Catholicism as well as to the other forms of belief. There are no Roman Catholic priests who show less taste for the minute individual observances, for extraordinary or peculiar means of salvation, or who cling more to the spirit and less to the letter of the law than the Roman Catholic priests of the United States. Nowhere is the doctrine of the church which prohibits the worship reserved to God alone from being offered to the saints more clearly inculcated or more generally followed. Yet the Roman Catholics of America are very submissive and very sincere.
>
> Another remark is applicable to the clergy of every communion. The American ministers of the Gospel do not attempt to draw or fix all the thoughts of man upon the life to come; they are willing to surrender a portion of his heart to the cares of the present, seeming to consider the goods of this world as important, though secondary, objects. If they take no part themselves in productive labor, they are at least interested in its progress and they applaud its results; and while they never cease to point to the other world as the great object of the hopes and fears of the believer, they do not forbid him honestly to court prosperity in this. Far from attempting to show that these things are distinct and contrary to one another, they study rather to find out on what point they are most nearly and closely connected.

> All the American clergy know and respect the intellectual supremacy exercised by the majority; they never sustain any but necessary conflicts with it. They take no share in the altercations of parties, but they readily adopt the general opinions of their country and their age, and they allow themselves to be borne away without opposition in the current of feeding and opinion by which everything around them is carried along. They endeavor to amend their contemporaries, but they do not quit fellowship with them. Public opinion is therefore never hostile to them; it rather supports and protects them, and their belief owes its authority at the same time to the strength which is its own and to that which it borrows from the opinions of the majority.
>
> Thus it is that by respecting all democratic tendencies not absolutely contrary to herself and by making use of several of them for her own purposes, religion sustains a successful struggle with that spirit of individual independence which is her most dangerous opponent. (6.)

At the same time, he marvelled at an industrial system that seemed to be developing in a spirit of relative equality:

> The United States of America has only been emancipated for half a century from the state of colonial dependence in which it stood to Great Britain; the number of large fortunes there is small and capital is still scarce. Yet no people in the world have made such rapid progress in trade and manufactures as the Americans; they constitute at the present day the second maritime nation in the world, and although their manufactures have to struggle with almost insurmountable natural impediments, they are not prevented from making great and dail advances.
>
> In the United States the greatest undertakings and speculations are executed without difficulty, because the whole population are engaged in productive industry, and because the poorest as well as the most opulent members of the commonwealth are ready to combine their efforts for these purposes. The consequences is that a stranger is constantly amazed by the immense public works executed by a nation which contains, so to speak, no rich men. The Americans arrived but as yesterday on the territory which they inhabit, and they have already changed the whole order of nature for their own advantage. They have joined the Hudson to the Mississipi and made the Atlantic Ocean communicate with the Gulf of Mexico, across a continent of more than five hundred leagues in extent which separates the two seas. The longest railroads that have been constructed up to the present time are in America.
>
> But what most astonishes me in the United States is not so much the marvelous grandeur of some undertakings as the innumerable multitude of small ones. Almost all the farmers of the United States combine some trade with agriculture; most of them make agriculture itself a trade. It seldom happens that an American farmer settles for good upon the land which he occupies; especially in the districts of the Far West, he brings land into tillage in

> order to sell it again, and not to farm it; he builds a farmhouse on the speculation that, as the state of the country will soon be changed by the increase of population, a good price may be obtained for it.
>
> Every year a swarm of people from the North arrive in the Southern states and settle in the parts where the cotton plant and the sugar-cane grow. These men cultivate the soil in order to make it produce in a few years enough to enrich them; and they already look forward to the time when they may return home to enjoy the competency thus acquired. Thus the Americans carry their businesslike qualities into agriculture, and their trading passions are displayed in that as in their other pursuits.
>
> The Americans make immense progress in productive industry, because they all devote themselves to it at once, and for this same reason they are exposed to unexpected and formidable embarrassments. As they are all engaged in commerce, their commercial affairs are affected by such various and complex causes that it is impossible to foresee what difficulties may arise. As they are all more or less engaged in productive industry, at the least shock given to business all private fortunes are put in jeopardy at the same time, and the state is shaken. I believe that the return of these commercial panics is an endemic disease of the democratic nations of our age. It may be rendered less dangerous, but it cannot be cured, because it does not originate in accidental circumstances, but in the temperment of these nations. (7.)

To de Tocqueville, then, the general standard of "self-interest, rightly understood," appeared to modify the demands of all groups in America, permitting each to exercise some influence, but no one group to dominate. Government's role was to preserve this balance. This is what justice required.

Today, however, the liberal belief that government should preserve a balance between wealth and virtue, between riches and service, between corporate power and spiritual ideals, has led to a confusion among many Americans about the vision of justice. Religious idealists and corporatists at least offer us clear standards--"love thy neighbor as thyself," from the Bible versus, "produce profits,", from the Gospel of Wealth. It is not clear now we do strike a balance between these two principles, so thoroughly at odds with one another. Some Americans say that they are "moderates," picking and choosing between idealism and materialism as it suits them. When <u>does</u> it suit them, however? On what basis?

Indeed, for many, the real American dream, and some would say the most naive dream of all, is that we can avoid these troublesome conflicts over justice altogether. We can pursue wealth, but remain moral. We can permit massive inequality, but not the indignities experienced by the poor. We can promote competition, but within a framework that teaches us self-interest "rightly understood." Americans, in short, seek the best of all possible worlds, and in its absence, we move back and forth between them. We elect one administration to challenge our moral and spiritual ideals, only to

exchange it for one that believes in corporate power when religious justice seems too difficult to handle. Then we grow disgusted at the seeming amorality of corporate leaders, so we shop around for moral leadership again. And so it goes.

Yet if there is any clue to what most Americans would define as their own ultimate standard of justice, it lies in the arguments to which both corporatists and early liberals felt obliged to respond. Every corporate leader--Carnegie included --knew that they had to defend themselves in accordance with the standards of religious justice. Just as clearly, the founders knew that the rights they were seeking had to be endowed "by their Creator." In short, when an American talks about justice, he usually does mean justice as Reverend Jesse Jackson talked about it--Divine justice. No less than the Puritans, we govern our moral activity in accordance with the Golden Rule. We disagree only--albeit an important only--on how much of this divine justice human beings are capable of achieving for themselves and one another.

C. Justice and Neighborhoods

Having examined briefly the competing standards of justice, we can suggest how they relate to the debates over building community in neighborhoods. Within the religious tradition, preserving specific communities is ultimately important, if only because the community becomes the social arena in which to fulfill God's will. Yet the religious idealist would not defend "neighborhood as a good in itself. Neighborhood would be a necessary, but insufficient means of achieving the Golden Rule. The idealist would always be working to challenge individual neighborhoods to adhere to these principles; and to establish them as the principles of common activity between the neighborhoods themselves.

To the corporatist, by contrast, it would be just to preserve a neighborhood only if the specific community were useful in the acquisition of social and personal wealth. Within corporate theory, there is no suggestion that communal life is important in itself, or for any other reason. Therefore, neighborhoods become expendable when the dictates of progress and technology and expansion become clear. In the name of this standard of justice, community residents have watched neighborhoods give way to highways, to factories, to nuclear power plants--in fact, to almost anything that could promise wealth and advancement to "the race" even if it imposed hardships on the "individuals."

The liberal conception of justice in neighborhoods would emphasize diversity. The liberal would say that the just neighborhood was one that promoted diversity among those living within it--

racially, ethnically, and economically. In neighborhood meetings, moreover, the liberal would be suspicious of all efforts of the community to limit the activities of individuals in the name of the collective goals. A corporatist might favor neighborhood rules that encouraged everyone to support business activities. A religious idealist might favor standards that directed neighbors to the pursuit of God. The liberal would say that all such rules were unfair. Individuals should have the right to pursue their own private ends, consistent with the freedom of others.

On what basis, then, would a liberal support common standards within the neighborhood as being just? John Rawls, a modern liberal theorist, has tried to come to grips with this problem in a book called A Theory of Justice. Rawls offers two rules for the just social contract: first, that there should be maximum individual freedom, consistent with the freedom of others; and second, that inequality should exist only when it benefits everyone. These standards, he believes, are rationally defensible and consistent with the general human desire for freedom.

Unfortunately, these rules offer us little guidance in determining just goals for the community itself. As we saw, for example, Andrew Carnegie believed that despite wide inequalities in wealth and power under capitalism, the system benefitted everyone by creating incentives to produce wealth. Without these incentives, poor people would be even poorer, even though everyone might be more equal. The Puritans, by contrast, would have wanted capitalists to accept the leadership of ministers. They argued that wealth would have little meaning to human beings unless the relationships between us reflected God's standards of love and companionship. Both capitalists and Puritans, in short, defended their own kind of inequality as being beneficial to everyone. How do we decide which of these inequalities is just without a notion of a just goal for human life itself? Liberalism is weak in answering this question, which explains why Americans raised on liberal assumptions about communities and societies have such difficulty in figuring out fair community standards.

Nonetheless, the idea of justice does have meaning to Americans as part of our religious heritage and from our belief that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" should be a goal for society as well as individuals. How this standard affects debates over security, reciprocity, and justice--the subject of our next sessions--will help us understand further how justice can become a vision for the neighborhood itself.

Footnotes

1. Jesse Jackson, "Time to Weld the Bell," Speech Delivered July 4, 1976, Philadelphia, Pa. Copies available through the Institute for the Study of Civic Values.

2. John Winthrop, "Model of Christian Charity," reprinted in Perry Miller and Thomas J. Johnson, Editors, The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings, Volume I, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1963, pp. 195-199, passim.

3. Andrew Carnegie, "Wealth," (North American Review, 1889) reprinted in Gail Kennedy, Editor, Democracy and the Gospel of Wealth, Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Company, 1949, pp. 2-5, passim.

4. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

5. Andrew Jackson, Veto of the Second National Bank, July 10, 1832, reproduced in Institute for the Study of Civic Values and Change Magazine, Editors, The Evolving Declaration: American Ideals and Human Dignity, New Rochelle, Change Magazine, 1976, Section II.

6. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Volume II, First Book, Chapter II, op. cit., p.28.

7. Ibid., Volume II, Second Book, Chapter XVIII, p. 165-67.

D. Questions for Discussion

1. List conditions within society that you feel are unjust. After each one, try to identify why you feel that they are unjust.

2. Now look at your reasons for thinking that conditions within society are unjust. Is there a common principle or principles running through all your reasons? What is it? If you were asked "What is justice," would this principle adequately explain what you think it is?

3. In this section, we have discussed justice within the corporate tradition, within the religious tradition, and within the liberal tradition. Which of these traditions comes closest to your own standard of justice? Consider the following specific statements below:

> "The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train...The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford."
>
> (Andrew Carnegie)

> "There is likewise a double Law by which we are regulated in our conversation, one towards another...By the first of these laws, man, as he was enabled so withall, is commanded to love his neigh-

bor as himself. Upon this ground stands all the precepts of the moral law, which concerns our dealings with other men."
(The Puritans)

"Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions...but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful...the humble members of society have a right to complain of the injustice of their government."
(Andrew Jackson)

4. Go back over your standards of security, reciprocity, and fellowship developed in previous sessions. In what tradition of fellowship would they fall most closely?

5. Can you think of standards of security, reciprocity, and fellowship adopted within your neighborhood that you would consider unjust? How about standards that you would consider just, but that your neighbors would not? How would you define the standards of justice in conflict?

6. What principles of justice would you adopt to govern a social contract for justice within your neighborhood? Within society as a whole?

E. For Further Reading

a. Religious or Idealistic

The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings. Volume I, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1963.

The Prophets. Volume I, Abraham Heschel, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

The Republic, Plato.

Small is Beautiful. E.F. Schumacher, New York, Harper & Row, 1973.

The Meaning of the City. Jacque Ellul, Grand Rapids, Mich., Eerdsman Co., 1970.

b. Corporate Justice

Democracy and the Gospel of Wealth. Gail Kennedy, Editor, Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Company, 1949.

Acres of Diamonds. Russell Corwell, Edited by Sidney Newton Brenner, Successful Achievement, 1971.

c. Liberal Justice

A Theory of Justice. John Rawls,
Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1971.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms" speech.

UNIT VI. JUSTICE AND SECURITY

A. Introduction

Developing a common sense of justice in a community involves more than mediating disputes. Mediation merely allows people to live together, whether they work together or not. An organizer or activist aims at getting people to work together. Indeed, he or she should view conflicts as opportunities to demonstrate why the perspective of justice is important to our common life.

Consider the example we examined at the beginning of the last session. We saw that without a common standard of justice, there would be no way to resolve the conflict between young people who make noise and older residents who prefer quiet. An activist who assumes that the neighbors cannot share common standards of justice, in fact, does not resolve these sorts of conflicts. Either they give up, or they side with one of the two parties at the expense of the other. Usually the situation grows worse. Young people continue to make noise. Senior citizens continue to call the police. It becomes a neighborhood war, until an angry kid throws a rock through somebody's window or a senior citizen files a formal complaint with the District Attorney. The bitter feelings poison the community indefinitely.

With a perspective of justice, particularly ideal justice, the activist would try to persuade each group to understand the needs of the other, then to accept a standard to govern them both. First, the activist would confront the neighbors with their precise situation--namely, that the neighborhood includes both young people and older people and that each side must learn to adjust to the other. Young people cannot expect the world to revolve entirely around their needs. Nor, however, can the older residents expect the neighborhood to return to the way they imagined it to be when they were growing up. Indeed, perhaps if their memory extended back to earlier days, they might recall that young people always have liked to make noise, perhaps even when they were young.

The issue, then, is where and when. Agreement to a neighborhood courtesy guideline establishing quiet hours and providing for advance warning before parties or other unusually loud activities--in exchange for which all residents would put up with a modest amount of noise during the daytime and early evening--would confirm the common principle. The important point, however, is that agreement to the rule should give rise to a new relationship between those who make it, one which reflects mutual respect and cooperation. The solution to the problem, in short, should promote a growing common commitment to justice in the neighborhood as a whole.

Confronting issues of neighborhood security should promote a sense of justice as well. All three traditions of justice support the right of individuals to protect themselves against harassment, vandalism, and crime. Corporate justice demands the protection of property. Religious justice asks us to adhere to the 10 Commandments and the Golden Rule. Liberal justice insists upon a respect for freedom and diversity. Even given the varied perspectives on issues of fairness, there should be unity around the idea that the neighborhood deserves to be safe.

The debate centers around how neighborhoods should encourage this sense of security. One position, closest to the tradition of corporate justice, argues that communities should worry most about how to remove potential offenders from within their midst, in the interests of preserving stability for the rest. A second position, operating within the liberal tradition, emphasizes developing proper procedures for preventing crime in the neighborhood, without dealing with criminals directly. A third position, reflecting a concern for ideal justice, asks us to do something to help potential and real offenders, as well as to help those who are threatened by their offenses. The three positions are not mutually exclusive; a community can work to remove troublemakers, establish procedures for preventing crime, while it also supports efforts to rehabilitate criminals. Since neighborhood crime often gives rise to a debate between these various approaches, however, it is important to understand each of them.

B. Corporate Justice and Security

Dr. Edward Banfield of the University of Pennsylvania makes the clearest case for the corporate strategy to deal with crime in The Unheavenly City Revisited. The following sums up his position:

The Future of the Lower Class
Edward Banfield (1.)

> So long as the city contains a sizable lower class, nothing basic can be done about its most serious problems. Good jobs may be offered to all, but some will remain chronically unemployed. Slums may be demolished, but if the housing that replaces them is occupied by the lower class it will shortly be turned into new slums. Welfare payments may be doubled or tripled and negative income tax instituted, but some persons will continue to live in squalor and misery. New schools may be built, new curricula devised, and the teacher-pupil ratio cut in half, but if the children who attend these schools come from lower-class homes, the schools will be turned into blackboard jungles, and those who graduate or drop out from them will, in most cases, be functionally illiterate. The streets may be filled with armies of policemen, but violent crime and civil disorder will decrease very little. If, however, the lower class will disappear--if, say, its members were overnight to acquire the attitudes, motivations, and habits of the working

class--the most serious and intractable problems of the city would all disappear with it.

The serious problems of the city all exist in two forms--a normal-class and a lower-class form--which are fundamentally different from each other. In its normal-class form, the employment problem, for example, consists mainly of young people who are just entering the labor market and who must make a certain number of trials and errors before finding suitable jobs; in its lower-class form, it consists of people who prefer the "action" of the streets to any steady job. The poverty problem in its normal-class form consists of people (especially the aged, the physically handicapped, and mothers with dependent children) whose only need in order to live decently is money; in its lower-class form it consists of people who would live in squalor and misery even if their incomes were doubled or tripled. The same is true with the other problems--slum housing, schools, crime, rioting; each is really two quite different problems.

The lower-class forms of all problems are at bottom a single problem: the existence of an outlook and style of life which is radically present-oriented and which therefore attaches no value to work, sacrifice, self-improvement, or service to family, friends, or community.

Despite all that was said to the contrary in the earlier chapters of this book, some readers may suspect that when the author uses the words "lower class" what he has in the back of his mind is "Negro." They may suspect, too, that the "real" purpose of the rather pessimistic account of the possibilities of reducing the size of the lower class that follows is to lay the basis for the conclusion that nothing should be done about any of the city's serious problems. There is, of course, no arguing with a reader who is determined to mistake one's meaning. All the author can do is to repeat once more that there are lower-class people, as defined here in ALL ethnic groups, including the Anglo-Saxon white Protestant one, and to point to the obvious fact that most Negroes are not improvident, do not live in squalor and violence, and therefore are plainly NOT lower class. As for the suspicion that the argument of this chapter will be used to justify a program of inaction, the reader is advised to wait and see.

The implication of all this may seem to be that the child should be taken from its lower-class parents at a very early age and brought up by people whose culture is normal. It will do little good to explain to a lower-class mother wherein her child-rearing practices are wrong: she is not really interested in improving her practices, perhaps because she cannot see anything wrong with them. In this and in other areas as well, her class culture sets sharp limits on what it is possible for her to do. It may seem, therefore, that the only thing to do is to take the child from her and put it in the care of a substitute who will bring it up properly.

However, the case is not as clear as it may first appear. It is not certain that taking the child from its mother may not cause even greater injury to it than would leaving it with her. (It should be remembered that the Iowa children whose IQ improved so remarkably were transferred from an INSTITUTION.) After a comprehensive review of the scientific literature, psychologist Leon J. Yarrow concludes that keeping a child with "grossly inadequate parents in a depriving and hostile environment" does not seem warrented by what is known of the dangers in separating a child from its mother, he stresses, however, that before a child is removed, strong efforts should be made to improve family conditions. (1.)

Presumably, the danger to the child in taking it from its mother is a function not only of the mother's incompetence but also of the ability of the mother-substitute to give it the support and stimulation that it needs. Even supposing (as it seems plausible to do) that at present the average substitute provides a much better environment for the child than does the average mother from whom children are taken, one still cannot conclude that ALL lower-class children should be taken from their mothers. For as the number of such removals increased, the quality of the average substitute would surely fall and that of the average mother would probably increase. It is one thing to provide proper adoptive homes and institutions for a few thousand children a year and an altogether different one to provide them for several hundred thousand. With respect to institutions, at least, it is likely that "depersonalized and affectionless but otherwise adequate" care is the best that can be expected on such a large scale.

Finally, it is questionable whether the state has the right to take a child from its parents in order to prevent an injury that is impalpable and contingent on its socialization into a lower-class culture. (2.) Even if it were certain (and of course it is not) that a child brought up in the lower class would turn out to be a "social problem" of some sort, it would not automatically follow that society has a right to interfere so drastically in people's lives. If failure to provide a child with adequate linguistic equipment is considered sufficient grounds for removing a child from its parents, so in consistency ought failure to provide it with "a star to steer by." This latter criterion would probably find almost as much application in the upper classes as in the lower. As a practical matter there is, of course, not the slightest possibility of a rule being adopted that might be applied to the rich as well as to the poor; this appears from the practice of the courts at the present time. "Neglect" and "abuse," the grounds for child removal in the law of most states, are everywhere interpreted narrowly to mean abandonment of the child, failing to supply it with food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, grossly mistreating it (as, for example, beating it or locking it in a closet for a long time), or outrageously endangering its moral welfare (as, for example, by carrying on the trade of prostitution in its presence.) (3.) Emotional ne-

glect seems the most obvious type to social workers," one of them writes, "but it is the most obscure to the courts in our experience." (4.) The inability of psychiatrists to specify precisely what "emotional neglect" consists of is one reason why the courts do not take note of it. (5.) One suspects, however, that if the condition were found only among the poor, it would prove no more difficult to define for legal purposes than, say, loitering.

In fact, even laws with respect to gross physical neglect and abuse are not enforced stringently or uniformly. Most cases of neglect and abuse never come to the attention of the authorities. Neighbors are reluctant to "interfere," teachers rarely report it when a pupil comes to school with cuts and bruises, and physicians frequently either fail to recognize the "child abuse syndrome" or decline to take the risk of being sued for damages if the parents are acquitted. Even when a case is reported and the facts are beyond dispute, the court may be unwilling to take custody of the child. (6.)

As a matter of logic, the simplest way to deal with the problem --and one which would not involve any infringement of parents' rights--would be to permit the sale of infants and children to qualified bidders both private and public. (7.) (Public bidding might be needed to ensure a price high enough to induce a sufficient number of lower-class parents to sell their children.) This assumes, of course, both that a parent who would sell a child would probably abuse or neglect it, and also that one who would buy it (especially if the price were high) would want it enough to take good care of it. The trouble with the idea, of course, is that it is wrong to represent human beings as commodities to be bought and sold.

Another possibility would be to offer "scholarships" to lower-class infants in amounts sufficient to induce their parents to place them in approved boarding schools on a year-round basis. These schools could be located in or near the children's neighborhoods and could be staffed by working-class women and girls from those neighborhoods. These arrangements would enable parents to see their children without having any responsibility for their care. This, of course, is the basic principle of KIBBUTZIM in Israel. The teaching of the children could not be done entirely on a classroom basis, however. In the early stages of acquisition of a new subject matter like reading or arithmetic, a tutorial arrangement (which is what the middle-class child gets from his parents at home) may be necessary; in effect, substitute mothers would have to be provided at least part of the time. (8.)

If it is not feasible to establish boarding schools, day nurseries may be the next best thing. They are, however, a poor substitute. Even under the best of circumstances, they are not likely to succeed in bringing children out of lower-class culture. In an experiment project in Boston, twenty-one children, aged two and one-half to six, from disorganized, lower-class families spent two or three mornings a week in a nursery school generously staffed with highly trained personnel. The school was intended to

help the child "gain a sense of mastery over his immediate surroundings."

> Trips were followed up with related stories and play activities and we usually saw to it that there was something to carry home. By encouraging the children to tell details about these trips to parents (standing by to make sure they would be listened to and adding facts of interest specifically for the parents), we assisted communication between parents and child and gave emphasis to the importance of the experience for the child. (9.)

After attendance of from one to three years, there was noticeable improvement in the children's appearance, body use, and self-esteem, and many had "learned to express their thoughts, feelings, and experiences with accuracy sufficient for communication." These gains certainly justified all the effort that was put forth, but the lives of the children did not change drastically. Language problems, for example, continued to hamper the children's ability to learn even after three years, and the experimenters doubted that these problems would ever be overcome. Reports that filtered back to them after the experiment had ended were not at all encouraging.

> Many of the children were placed in situations where more demands were made on them than they were mature enough to fulfill. At least five of them repeated one of the early grades.
>
> It is our impression that as failures began to follow one another, the inevitable regression to more discouraged, impatient, frightened, passive behavior occurred. (10.)

Lower-class children could probably benefit a great deal more than they do from day nurseries were it not for the fact that they are at once confused and stultified by what they are (and are not) exposed to at home. When the influence of the nursery has made conditions for changing the child's outlook and life style feasible, even small improvements in home life might have large effects. As a rule, it is on the mother, or the mother-substitute, that efforts to improve the home environment should concentrate. She is best able to give the child the support and stimulation it needs, and, fortunately, she is likely to be less--perhaps much less--improvident, irresponsible, and violent than her mate. As was noted in Chapter Three, it is the male, especially the young one, to whom lower-class culture comes most "naturally." For some reason--perhaps because extreme present-orientedness is incompatible with the childbearing function, perhaps because lower-class sex is sometimes too much like rape to be very enjoyable to women, or perhaps because "toughness" (one of Walter B. Millers foci of lower-class culture) is usually regarded as a male attribute--women born and brought up in the lower class

very often behave in ways that are not characteristic of that class. the lower-class mother--but not the father--is often very much concerned with the children's welfare: she may try to keep them in school and out of trouble; sometimes she struggles to buy a house. Usually, her efforts are futile. Her mate and, as soon as they are old enough, her sons are at best noncontributors to any "family" project and at worst active opponents. If she manages to save anything, they soon lay hands on it and squander it. "Getting ahead" is her idea, not theirs.

It would seem, then, that the aim of policy should be to encourage the mother's aspirations and to strengthen her hand as much as possible. (11.) This is easier said than done, however. One suggested innovation is the "peace bond" an arrangement by which a man incurs an agreed-upon penalty, usually the forfeiture of a small sum, if he does what he has agreed not to do. It is unlikely that the lower-class male would be deterred by such a penalty, or even perhaps by the prospect of jail. Another proposal is that police powers be redefined to allow arrests for misdemeanors on probable cause (in most states a police officer who did not see a misdemeanor committed cannot make an arrest without a signed complaint). This suggestion is open to several objections. One is that such a redefinition of police powers might lead to greater embarrassment and inconvenience for those persons who (because of color, low income, or whatever) are taken to be lower class when in fact they are not. Moreover, the lower-class woman may be just as unwilling to offer the police a verbal complaint as she is to offer them a signed one. There is still another reason why workable ways of protecting the woman from her mate are unlikely to be found: the lower-class woman will often tolerate considerable abuse rather than lose the companionship of a man. Rather than risk being abandoned, she may deny that she and her children were beaten, that the welfare money was spent on a drunken spree, and all the rest. (In Illinois, the police CAN arrest for probable cause on many misdemeanors but they almost never do, partly for these reasons, partly because they do not want to create additional frictions within families, and partly because they want to avoid assaults by angry mates. (12.)) Against her own unwisdom (if this is what it really is) the police, the courts, and the whole power of government cannot protect her. And so it appears that it will be very difficult if not impossible to realize even the minimum goal of policy--namely, to protect the lower-class woman and her children against the violence of her mate.

The conclusion is unavoidable that for at least several decades there will be a lower class which, while small both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the whole population, will nevertheless be large enough to constitute a serious problem--or, rather, a set of serious problems--in the city. The question arises, therefore, as to what policies might minimize the difficulties that must inevitably exist when a lower-class minority lives in the midst of an increasingly middle-and upper-class society.

When the lower class lived on farms and in small cities like Elmtown (the population of which, it will be recalled, was about 25 percent lower class), its members were to some extent both held in check and protected by being physically isolated from each other. Also, there were few, if any, opportunities for easy money, and without money the lower-class person was effectively tied down. An even greater constraint on him, perhaps, was his visibility. In the slums of a big city, it is easy to drop out of sight. In a town or small city, on the other hand, there is no place to hide. The individual is known personally by the landlord, corner merchant, and policeman; he cannot escape into anonymity. In the big city he need never see the same merchant, landlord, or policeman twice. As an economist might put it, one who wants to lead a lower-class style of life has the advantage of numerous "economics of scale" in the big city.

Therefore, from the standpoint of a society that wants at once to protect lower-class people from each other and to protect itself from them, there are advantages in having lower-class people live in the town or small city, or, if they must live in the large one, in having them scattered in a way such that they will not constitute a "critical mass" anywhere. These considerations suggest that government programs (subsidies to large farmers, for example) that tend to push unskilled people off the land and out of rural areas ought to be stopped, that welfare programs should aim at making life in towns and small cities much more advantageous to the chronically poor than it is now (thereby reducing one of their incentives to come to the city), and that, within the large cities, there should be an end to that kind of urban renewal (almost the only kind in fact) the tendency of which is simply to shift the lower class from one place to another and not to dissipate it. As Wolfgang and Ferracuti remark with reference to the "subculture of violence," "Housing projects and neighborhood areas should be small microcosms of the social hierarchy and value system of the central dominant culture. It is in homogeneity that the subculture has strength and durability. (13.)

It might be argued that the hardest cases among the lower classes ought to be treated as semicompetent (incompetents being those--for example, children, the insane, the feeble-minded--who are incapable of knowing where their own interest, not to mention the social interest, lies). Such persons could be cared for in what may be called semi-institutions--small enclaves of lower-class people who, either because they wanted help in "staying out of trouble" or because they desired certain material benefits (extra-generous allowances for housing, food, clothing, and health care) would agree to certain limitations of their freedom. For example, they might agree to receive most of their income in kind rather than in cash, to forego ownership of automobiles, to have no more than two or three children, and to accept a certain amount of surveillance and supervision from a semi-social-worker-semi-policeman.

Several considerations, however, argue against semi-institutional care for the lower class. As a practical matter, it is unlikely that many of the hardest cases--those from whom society most needs protection--would choose semi-affluence in a semi-institution in preference to the life of the slum. If these hardest cases are to be controlled at all, they must be controlled totally--that is, put into prison. This approach is obviously out of the question, since "being lower class" is not a crime or committable condition and is not at all likely to be made one. The tendency, in fact, is in the opposite direction: to confine fewer and fewer of those who have been convicted of crimes or have been judged mentally incompetent.

A very important danger in such efforts to restrain the lower class is that they might be applied also to people who are NOT lower class, thus abridging the freedom of these others without justification. This danger exists in part because euphemisms --e.g., "the poor"--have collapsed necessary distinctions between the competent and the semi-competent. (the blind, for example, are often lumped together in welfare programs with lower-class poor. (14.)) It exists also because prejudice or convenience sometimes causes caretakers to treat externals--skin color, speech ways, and so forth--as indicators of lower-class culture.

Another objection arises from the fact that at the present time (fifty or more years ago it was otherwise) most lower-class people in the large cities are black. Putting them in semi-institutions would inevitably appear to be a reflection of racial inferiority or an expression of racial prejudice. What is even more important, perhaps, is that taking the lower class black out of the slum of the great city would tend to cut him off psychologically from the black community. It is by no means inconceivable that the "black pride" movement may engender morale in the mass of black people--morale that the lower class may in some degree share if it is in close physical contact with the main body of blacks. To be sure, one could argue this the other way, contending, first, that nothing would do more for the morale of the black community than to have the worst of the lower class removed from its midst and, second, that lower-class people are by nature of their culture immune to any moral influence from the surrounding society.

Finally, there is clearly a tension if not an out-and-out incompatibility between the goal of restraining the lower-class individual and that of stimulating him. The first calls for reducing his freedom, the second for enlarging it. If it were possible to identify persons who are irremediably lower class and to place them and them alone under restraints, this objection would not apply. In fact, there is no way of knowing which individuals would respond significantly to incentives and which would not. The danger of perpetuating and increasing the present-orientedness while endeavoring to restrain it makes the whole enterprise of restraint suspect. Despite

the high costs to society and to the lower-class individual himself that follow from increasing his freedom, doing so may well be the best course of action in the long run.

FOOTNOTES

1. Leon J. Yarrow, "Separation from Parents During Early Childhood," in M. L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman, eds., Review of Child Development Research (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964),1:128.

2. In 1972 the Iowa State Supreme Court, in an 8-0 ruling, held that a pair of four-year-old twins must be placed up for adoption because their mother, whose IQ was 47, could not give them proper care and attention. Expert witnesses testified that the twins were in poor condition due chiefly to "lack of stimulation" and "need of love and affection." New York Times, October 19, 1972.

3. Cf. Leontine Young, Wednesday's Children: A Study of Child Neglect and Abuse (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

4. Personal communication.

5. K.B. Cheney, "Safeguarding Legal Rights in Providing Protective Service," Children, 13 (May-June 1966): 86-92.

6. Cf. Larry B. Silver, M.D., "Child Abuse Syndrome: A Review," Medical Times Magazine, 96 (August 1968): 803-820.

7. In fact, there are "gray" and "black" markets in babies. The "gray" market (legal in all but two states) involves use of a lawyer rather than an adoption agency; in the "black" market the child is simply bought (although the payment to the mother might be called a "gift"), the birth certificate sometimes being falsified. According to the executive director of the Child Welfare League of America, it is becoming "rather normal" to pay $10,000 in a "gray" or "black" market. "The baby business," he is quoted as saying, "is expanding all over the country." New York Times, February 20, 1973.

8. Arthur R. Jensen, in Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen, eds., Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968),p. 166.

9. Eleanor Pavenstedt, Ed., The Drifters (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), p. 199.

10. Ibid., p. 218.

11. An elaborate study of the WIN (Work Incentive) Program makes an opposite recommendation: that welfare payments for children be channeled through fathers instead of directly to mothers "to the end of constraining marital dissolution and buttressing paternal authority..." It is not clear, however, whether the fathers in question are of the sort described here as lower class. Samuel Z. Klausner, "The Work Incentive Program: Making

Adults Economically Independent" (Philadelphia, Center for Research on the Acts of Man, 1972), p. xvii.

12. Personal communication from James Q. Wilson.

13. Marvin E. Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti, The Subculture of Violence (London: Tavistock Publications, 1967), p. 299. They cite (p. 304) a study showing that rates for major crimes are lower in cities where the class structure is "balanced."

C. Liberal Justice

In terms of specific neighborhood and communities, Banfield's main premise here is that it is unfair to subject "normal" people to the peculiar problems faced by so-called "lower-class" people. Society requires a basic orientation to achievement and security to survive. Those who lack this orientation are unworthy members of the community, who should receive special treatment until they show willingness to adhere to the community's standards. Banfield applies this perspective not only to convicted criminals, but to those whose patterns of behavior threaten accepted standards generally. If his position seems harsh, we may point out that it is the basic view of all those who move away from a "changing" neighborhood rather than confront its internal difficulties. They don't demand removing "lower-class" people from the neighborhoods because they remove themselves. If they had to stay, however, they would side with Banfield and argue fiercely that theirs was the just position.

A second approach, more in the liberal tradition, attempts to protect the neighborhood against crime without passing judgement or dealing directly with the criminals. This is the perspective offered by the growing number of community crime prevention programs, summarized in this passage from A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, prepared by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals:

> In many communities the only response to crime has been a retreat behind locks, bars, alarms and guards. Although these prophylactic measures may be steps in self-protection, they can lead to a lessening of the bonds of mutual assistance and neighborliness.
>
> Other communities, however, have developed collective means of protection in addition to traditional self-protection measures. The principle behind neighborhood security efforts is group action to make blocks, apartments, streets, and parks safer from and less vulnerable to crime.
>
> In some areas, citizens have banded together to report crimes in progress or suspicious activities in their neighborhoods. Organizations offer rewards to those reporting criminal activity or hold

special crime prevention clinics to reduce robbery and burglary. Citizens have initiated campaigns to educate people to the seriousness of shoplifting or to give tips on preventing auto theft. (2.)

There is little empirical evidence on the effectiveness of neighborhood crime prevention programs in reducing crime. The popularity of these programs suggests, however, that they are quite effective in reinforcing a sense of security. The neighbors know that they are not alone. They know that people around them are as concerned about vandalism and harrassment as they are. This knowledge reveals that the community shares a sense of justice at least on the fundamental issues of security that the neighborhood faces. In this period, even this basic agreement may be necessary to reassure citizens that they can share standards of justice with others and attempt to enforce them. Moreover, by adopting a community crime prevention program, the neighborhood may persuade those within the community tempted to rob houses or harass people in the streets that they will no longer get away with it.

C. Ideal Justice

Some argue, however, that while efforts to prevent crime are just, they will not last unless society attempts to deal with those who are committing them. By this argument, community organizations should join in efforts to combat the conditions that give rise to crime-unemployment, bad housing, inadequate education. Moreover, such organizations should support efforts to rehabilitate criminals that take place in the community, rather than in prisons and centers isolated from society. John Maher, an ex-offender who has established a rehabilitation program that ends up involving ex-prisoners directly in political action, makes a powerful argument for this position in explaining why he moved his center, Delancey St., to a rich neighborhood in San Francisco:

John Maher of Delancey Street
by Grover Sales (3.)

JOHN MAHER: I hadn't been in Synanon six months before I realized that most of the people there weren't nearly as bright as everyone said, but were dependent idiots. But it was a necessary phase of growth to have them believe themselves to be creative and imaginative social planners, so I went along with the party line. One of the problems of curing addicts is that their ego has been deflated, and a trick to get them back on their feet, and keep them clean long enough to re-educate them, is to forcefully inflate their ego. The slightest accomplishment must get massive approval from the group, like a bunch of Hadassah ladies oohing and aahing over 'little Sylvia Horowitz, who will probably grow up to win the Nobel Prize--did you ever taste little Sylvia's cookies?' So when little Sylvia

goes out into the world to discover that nobody gives a ---- about her, or her cookies, her ego is so rapidly deflated she feels acute pain. Now, the smarter people in Synanon sensed this ego inflation was artificial. As a director of the Foundation, I could go to the president of most banks and get an appointment, or crash a senator's office because he's never sure how many votes I represent. Looking back on it, it sounds crazy. Here I am, out of prison less than a year, never having a successful marriage, never propagating my own kind, poorly educated except for the reading I could do in jail--and people would ask me to address huge college rallies while the mob cheers, "Right on!"

Any independent thinker like me who goes into a place like Synanon, where egos are artificially inflated by the social device of setting one up as intelligent by virtue of one's lifestyle, is a threat if he offers an equally valid, but ALTERNATIVE life-style; so the group brings heavy pressure to make you conform. In Games, people would attack me for 'obscurantism' because I thought many of them rigid and silly in their views. Since I tend to talk in NON SEQUITURS, it drove them bananas because it didn't fit into their pattern of total conformity. Just like in reform school, where they said my attitude was wrong, Dederich would counter by giving me another marathon chewing-out, a verbal haircut. When you have a society like Synanon in which the ultimate virtue is obedience, and the unconscious gut of the group is not loose and diverse, they want to equalize everybody so they don't feel left out. The mob unconsciously tries to prevent those unique and brilliant talents within the group from doing their SCHTICK.

Just as Dederich, when in AA, conceived a better way of treating the addictive personality, I began to think of a logical extension of Synanon. The three organizations that have cured more drug addicts are, in order, Red China, the Black Muslims, and Synanon. But they have done so only at the tremendous cost of imposing total conformity. There began to take shape in my mind an organization that would represent an enormous step forward in the social evolutionary process--a group that could cure addicts by tolerating diversity, and get these social victims back in society as productive members.

From the time Dederich got my head on straight, I hoped that Synanon would become something else. I was far more impressed with its potential than with its reality. Dederich was quickly abandoning his early revolutionary position to retreat into an isolation that was Amish in totality. He began to adopt the notion that since the world outside is crazed beyond redemption, you build a remote and alternative community, pool everyone's money, goods, and services, and move in for the rest of your life. Over the years, Dederich has changed from a preacher of social revolution to a preacher of social containment.

I didn't see this as feasible, since we are utterly dependent upon the mainstream of the economy and the laws. I thought the way to survive was to build a strong economic base to endure the stress of the twentieth century, and to ally ourselves with other people of good will--The Farm Workers Union, Chicano groups, Prisoners'

Union, peace movement, women's lib, gay lib, the responsive people working within the two major political parties, and the other potent social movements that were mushrooming in the sixties. Synanon never had any contact with these groups, or even a rudimentary working knowledge of this social upheaval going on around them.

When I split from Synanon, I had no idea of starting my own movement. I was like a man trained to live in a company town. What does he do when he goes to New York? I could discuss Emerson and Albee, but didn't know how to get a Social Security card. But in the back of my mind there was a nagging notion that someday I would have to build a Society of Friends that could bypass all the nonsense in our culture.

It all started one day on Polk Street where I was living in a cheap flat, casting about for something to do. Ran into an old Chicano buddy, drunk, punching some people out over Willie Mays's batting average; took him home and put him up for the night. Next day he brings his wife. Then four Synanon splitees heard about where I was living and moved in. Had to look around for more room and found a two-story flat on Bush Street that rented for $300 a month.

I raised the rent money by borrowing from loan sharks, what we call shylocks, who are illegal because they charge usurious interest rates, $6.00 for every $5.00 borrowed, interest payable weekly, and Mafia methods of collecting, like breakage of legs or worse. None of the legit loan companies or banks would touch me with my criminal record, or if they did, they wanted exorbitant interest. But the shylocks charged me no interest at all. Why? Because they were the only money lenders I could find who were interested in helping kids.

Maher at first called the new group Ellis Island, after New York's debarkation point for nineteenth-century immigrants eager to start life in the New World; but he soon found the name copyrighted by another corporation. He settled for Delancey Street, Manhattan's East Side settlement of Jews, Irish, and Italians who sewed the cloth, built the subways, saved their pennies, and sent for their families abroad.

We wanted to get back to the original conception of a bunch of wild-eyed fanatics who came over here to build the New Jerusalem and not ask Uncle Nixon for another handout. We're radicals in Delancey Street because we work.

Maher incorporated those concepts that had worked for Synanon: no drugs or violence, the Game, the need to locate in rich neighborhoods, a return to the early American work ethic to end the individual's dependence on welfare, federal grants, corporate and foundation funds. He rejected the ideas of Synanon that he felt were proven failures: Synanon had withdrawn to an isolated, utopian commune that had no contact with current social movements; Delancey Street would build a working alliance with hardhat unions, women's lib, senior citizens, the Prisoners' Union, the Farm Workers Union, the Urban League, the antiwar movement,

gay lib, the Black Caucus, and responsive Republicans and Democrats in City Hall, Sacramento, and Congress. Synanon took no part in politics; Delancey Street's political clubs would get out the vote for supportive candidates and would lobby to change laws. Synanon discouraged its people from leaving the commune to live and work on the outside; Delancey Street would aim to put the ex-addict back into society as a productive member with strong economic and emotional ties to the group. Synanon stressed total allegiance to an organization where everyone had to fit in; Delancey Street would encourage a diversity of ideas and life-styles.

Synanon feels the individual is best served by the survival of the community; Delancey Street feels the community is best served by the survival of the individual. If Synanon is a monastic order, Delancey Street is the Masons, and like the Masons, we plan to survive under ANY regime.

With more than a dozen residents crammed into the stolidly middle-class Bush Street apartment, Maher was ready to invade a rich neighborhood, in keeping with the philosophy he picked up from Dederich.

All social problems should move to where the rich people live. One of the crazy situations in this country is that rich people's living space is CHEAPER per square foot than slum warehouse space. For the same money that would keep fifteen senior citizens or crippled vets in a rat trap at government expense, they could live in a gorgeous mansion in the ritziest part of town. But of course rich people don't want them there, so they keep these halfway houses in the ghetto where you can't cure addicts, any more than you can cure an alchoholic in a bar; in the morning people line up at the welfare office, and a night they line up to get a fix or buy a whore. You've got to bring these problems to the people with money, expertise, and the political clout to DO something about them. Integration has to start at the TOP to take hold in this country, not in slums where whites are scared blacks will take their jobs. The visible role model of the upper classes must be the FIRST to demonstrate integration. But social workers in the South Bronx try to integrate Italians, blacks, and Irish. When they succeed, the family traditions and the economy fall apart, leaving these people dependent on the state. In the old days, a slum Italian could find a family connection; when this ends, he winds up on welfare. This enforced self-sustenance from above puts tremendous power in the hands of the bureaucratic establishment.

Delancey's way to integrate is to start at the top, not because it's sweet or nice to be integrated, but because we've been deluded so long about other people that we have to surround ourselves with folks from all walks of life--and the STRETCH to relate to them. This is opposed to what conventionally passes as therapy, where upper-middle class people who already agree on premises, sit around and 'identify' each other into a cheap 'peak experience.'

Here, we take people who can't relate, put them in a reality situation where they must learn to, and they come out stronger. This applies to rich people as well as the slum addict. So we move into the best neighborhoods and tell our leading citizens, "Look, you people CREATED this problem, so we've dumped it right in your own back yard where you can't sweep it under the carpet. And now, by God, you better learn to do something about it.

On New Year's Day 1971, Maher moved his entourage of twenty-five interracial ex-addicts into a commanding, three-story brick mansion in the heart of Pacific Heights, San Francisco's ultrafashionable and rigidly zoned residential area. Its twenty-nine rooms, plus nine separate baths, had once housed the consular corps of the United Arab Republic; it had stood empty since the Six-Day Arab-Israeli War of 1967, when Nassar announced that the Americans had bombed Egypt, because he didn't believe the Israelies capable of such a massive air strike. Thinking an Egypt-USA war was imminent, the Arabs vacated the building and left it in the hands of Coldwell-Banker, the largest real estate firm in the West, to sublet. During its three years of vacancy, the mansion had been repeatedly broken into and vandalized, making it even less enticing to prospective tenants, especially in Pacific Heights, where zoning laws restricted its occupancy to a family of five.

Delancey Street set up headquarters in "Arabia" with the help of nearly a dozen lawyers, tax specialists, developers and real-estate brokers--all former Synanon Game players who had transferred their loyalty to Maher's new group. One of them spotted the "For Lease" sign in the window and began negotiations with Coldwell-Banker in June 1970 for the move into the mansion for $1,000 a month rent. Maher went back to his interest-free loan sharks to borrow $2,000 for the first and last months' rent, gave the check to Coldwell-Banker, and signed a standard lease that was forwarded to the Arabs for their signature. Delancey Street residents then began to clean up three years of vandalism and debris.

The pattern of harrassment encountered by Synanon when they moved into fancy neighborhoods was now repeated. A group of twenty-six neighbors sent a telegram to the Arab's Special-Interest Section of the Indian Embassy in Washington, a warning that their San Francisco home had been invaded by drug addicts, convicts, and whores. The Arabs hired one of San Francisco's most prestigious law firms to get them out.

One morning at 6:00, the police forcibly entered Delancey's plush new home with drawn pistols.

My night watchman was asleep on the couch, and your basic Patrolman O'Hara shoves a gun in his face and barks, "Where's yer lease?" Now my night watchman is a Puerto Rican from Spanish Harlem where they never heard of leases--you either pay the rent, or get out. So he wakes up and says, 'Lease? Officer, I ain't even got no ----in' dog!'

Delancey's attorney Henry Hill countered with a visit to the local station house, threatening the Police Department with a lawsuit. He pressed into service Myron Moskowitz, a Berkeley specialist in landlord-tenant law with experience on behalf of tenants evicted on three days' notice. They filed an action for declaratory release against the United Arab Republic, insuring that it would take at least two years to bring the eviction case to court. Henry Hill discovered that under the Foreign Agents Registration Act--a panicky holdover from the Joe McCarthy era--the blue-chip law firm hired by the Arabs was required to register with the government as the agent of a foreign power. Since the firm had failed to comply with this half-forgotten statute, Maher had lawyer Hill write letters to the late J. Edgar Hoover and then Attorney General John Mitchell, demanding that the law firm be indicted for high treason.

The Arabs sent a polished diplomat from Washington to negotiate. Hill told him,'You've got everything to gain and nothing to lose by leasing the building to them. We've spent hundreds of dollars clearing the place, improving the property, preventing further vandalism, and we'll give the house back to you when the United Arab Republic re-establishes diplomatic relations with the U.S.' Impressed by the immaculate transformation of a former disaster area, the Arab diplomat tabled all attempts to oust Maher for two years, only to resume hostilities when Nixon established relations with the new Egyptian leader Anwar Sadat.

After a long and heated zoning battle involving City Hall, a polarized Board of Supervisors, and front-page headlines, Delancey turned the empty, but spotless embassy back to the Sadat regime.

This did not mean that Delancey's people were homeless. They had leased seven other properties, and with an audacity that goaded the zoning authorities of the Pacific Heights Improvement Association to launch a redoubled attack, Maher purchased for $160,000 the sumptuous former home of the Soviet embassy, three blocks away from the Arabian mansion.

The purchase of what Delancey Streeters now called "Russia" was arranged by a cabal of former Synanon squares. Rubin Glickman, a young attorney who dabbled in restaurant management, was a specialist in real-estate law. Richard Kirschman spent six years developing San Francisco's Fox Plaza, a $23 million, thirty-three-story complex of apartments, business offices, and high-toned shops. They first met in an explosive Synanon Game and loathed each other on sight. After weeks of trading obscenities and indictments in Games, Glickman and Kirschman formed a close bond, born of their mutual boredom with routine money making, a need

for social involvement, and their delight with Maher as Game player and companion. With Stanley Berney, a top realtor-developer they met in Games, they spearheaded the growth of Synanon's real-estate holdings. Glickman helped Dederich negotiate the purchase of Oakland's Athens Club for $750,000.

When San Quentin released Mike Killean after a six-year stretch for armed robbery, he made the front page with a little help from his friends.

Killean was met at the main gate by three glistening Cadillac limousines driven by chauffers in pearl-grey tunics with caps and puttees of black leather. Lounging with heavy-lidded insolence in the plush back seats were six Havana-puffing Godfathers in black fedoras, wrap-around sunglasses, $50 silk shirts, hand-painted ties, and double-breasted pinstripes.

The head Mafioso in the lead car flipped the switch that lowered the window, crooked his finger at the guard and growled, 'Hey you-git our friend over here. Quick!'

'Yes-sir!" With hurried deference, the guard escoted Killean to the car where the Godfather kissed him on both cheeks, handed him a cigar, made room for him in the back seat and signaled the caravan to drive away slowly.

Someone tipped off the newsmen that the Mob was picking up a buddy, and a four column photo of this bizarre procession made page one of the San Francisco Chronicle, which with little probing, learned that Killean's reception committee was not the Mafia, but the Delancey Street Foundation in rented limousines and borrowed pinstripes.

The main purpose of this socially pointed practical joke was, as usual, lost on the newspapers. We wanted to dramatize how our idiotic prison system makes the guards as much of a victim as the inmates. Suppose our friend at San Quentin was met by a cruddy Ford pickup driven by some slob in ----y dungarees. Know what the guard would have said? 'Git that truck away from the main gate, take it around the back, we'll let this ---hole out when we're ----in' well ready--and what's that in yer coat?' So what WE do is drive up like crass hoodlums, but RICH ones, and the guards fell all over themselves; one even touched his cap in salute. They've been programmed to respond to a symbol: 'Anyone who drives a block-long Cad and dresses that expensively must know somebody IMPORTANT, may know the governor, the warden, someone who can cost me a promotion if I'm not nice to him.' We've got to find a way to unite the working classes like these prison guards who have this silly notion they're part of the establishment.

In California, where people are worried about mental health, the government builds mental hospitals. Any SANE person could have told them in front, that what they were building wouldn't work,

so they build them to create giant patronage. Then, when the bureaucrats need the taxpayers' vote, they say, 'Do away with mental hospitals and save money,'so the taxpayers are happy Reagan is cutting the budget. Then they turn around and say, 'We have to lock in the unemployment-conscious vote,' so they build two new prisons! Endless, crazy round-robin! We have eighteen mental institutions in California, and a number of them are closing, so why do we have to build new prisons? If we MUST have this insane prison system, why don't we just use the mental hospitals and build WALLS around them.

Reagan's political position is unassailable. Since the mental hospitals don't work, and in fact torture people, he neutralizes the left-liberals by closing them, and pacifies right-wing taxpayers who are 'tired of carrying all those indigents on our rolls.' They don't see the relationship between closing mental hospitals, cutting off psychiatric care, and the increase of rape and murder in the streets, any more than these taxpayers saw the relationship between bombing Indo-China, and their children, who didn't want to get shot, going a little crazy.

We built this mock-up cell and tow it all over town because we want these taxpayers to witness the incredible insanity of putting a youngster in one of these cages with Nazi hoodlums, motorcycle riders running in gangs, assaultive homosexual rapists, Mexicans who think they're the Mafia, some kill-the-honkie black guerrillas, and twenty Charlie Manson types. What happens is that any SANE man kills anybody who gets too close to him, not because he's a bad guy, but because he'd have to be crazy to do anything else. Ten years later they unloose this snarling animal, fighting to survive, on society and his family. You lock a dog in a cage, terrorize and abuse it every day, and when you open the cage two years later, the dog doesn't lick your hand for letting it out--the dog takes a healthy bite out of your ass.

While Maher passed out protest postcards to Governor Reagan, a furious woman was shaking under his nose the morning's headline of a cop-killer in Oakland: 'Why don't you do-gooder, bleeding-hearts show a little sympathy for the widow of this policeman, the victims of these monsters you protect and coddle?' and flounced off before Maher could answer.

What this poor woman doesn't realize is that these kinds of horrendous crimes are such a small minority. Most people in jail are there for smoking pot, bad checks, boosting a car. Obviously the whacko in Chicago who killed nine nurses belongs in a hospital, but what about the nineteen-year old purple heart veteran who got hooked in Vietnam, came back, hung out with the wrong crowd, and got ten years in the slammer? People have to be unsold on this idiot notion

of PUNISHMENT. Arguments against prison reform are arguments against the taxpayers' own interests. You drive men crazy by locking them in cages like this one and, in or out, they cost you MONEY. We've got to teach middle-class people about prison reform. The radicals and honest conservatives dig the issues, just like sane liberals do, because they're intense people. But that poor woman was right when she said we 'coddle criminals'--Nixon, Agnew, the head of General Motors that turns out unsafe cars, but what we DON'T coddle are poor people, blacks, Chicanos, or ghetto prostitutes.

John Maher is obsessed with the future. 'Either we grow, or we die.' his plans for Delancey Street's growth are not modest, and the possible uses of establishment politics to insure this growth are never far from his mind.

There will be no Republican or Democratic convention in our congressional district in which Delancey Street's political clubs are not a deciding factor. This sounds pompous, but NOT when you can turn out a larger crowd than all other factions combined. We helped get the vote out for John Burton and elected him congressman from our district by canvassing door-to-door, registering the unregistered voters, handing out stickers and literature the day before the election. We computerized all the precincts, color-coding them on huge maps. We helped the aged, the farmworkers, the women, the minorities, woke them up on election day and bused them to the polls. Come delegation-picking time, all these people will show up, and the old party hacks will have to step aside. Delancey Street packed the hall and supported the three delegates from our district to the 1974 Democratic Convention in Kansas City: John Dearman, the law partner of our friend Assemblyman Willie Brown; Anne Daley, Sheriff Hongisto's secretary and an old party war horse; Mattie Jackson, the black labor leader on the Central Labor Council.

Delancey Street will also determine the swing vote in San Francisco's next race for mayor. Most major candidates, from both parties, are friends who went to bat for us, and have put in a lot of time around here. I have six hundred fanatical volunteers waiting in the wings, and the candidate for mayor who promises the best for the people will get our support. We will canvas every district and get out the vote.

All this scares the be-Jesus out of the establishment, because we're poor people working WITHIN the system, and this is what these animals fear most, not radicalism, or student sit-ins.

This is why the establishment gets so terrified when I talk about using the traditional methods of Tammany Hall to achieve the just society. They don't want Mexicans, Blacks and poor Whites to understand that this is EXACTLY how the Jews, Irish and Italians pulled themselves out of the ghetto. To stop people in Boston and Chicago from calling him a nigger, the Irishman had to open some saloons and funeral parlors to turn out the vote. For every grandmother whose funeral was paid for by Boston's Mayor Curley, he got a hundred votes, year in and year out.

Delancey Street's going to open saloons: one near the San Francisco CHRONICLE, one by City Hall, one in the Mexican and Black districts, one in the radical-chic part of town, where we already have a restaurant-bar. In the back room of every bar we put a computer, programmed to give the voting records and campaign contributors to all officials, all welfare and veterans benefits available in the city and state governments, all taxes, so that a man can come in and say, 'My house is taxed $4,000--and everybody else on my block is taxed $2,500.' So we get the computer to tell him who to bribe. Or an Italian immigrant woman comes in and says, 'They arrested my son Nunzio, and I don't speak English so good.' We'll help her raise hell, give her the data, find her a lawyer.

Delancey street aims to get back to the old days when a man can come into a saloon and say, 'My brother's been pinched and needs a lawyer, we're from 134th Street,' and the ward heeler would calculate how many votes this would mean to the Democratic party and say, 'A fine young boy like that deserves a break.' Come election time, his whole family votes straight the straight Delancey Street ticket.

The opposition can hassle us for fifteen years. If they take away our tax-exemption on political grounds, then we will become a religion. In fact, we plan to take over empty churches--and there's going to be a lot of them, just like there's a lot of empty mansions, and going cheap. We want to take over a synagogue where Jews of god conscience could go without a mink coat, or take over a Catholic Church for those who actually BELIEVE in the words of the Founder. We need Protestant churches we can turn over to a good minister and tell him, 'We don't agree with your bible-thumping, but you seem like an ethical man who stands fast. Why don't you take over this church and preach?' We HAVE to go into religions, just as we have to go into unions, politics, everything. There's no point to our work unless the world changes. Otherwise, we'll just sit here forever and merely cure the next crop of dope fiends.

What could happen on a national scale is that neighborhoods like ours will organize into community-action groups to stamp out the drug peddlers and the Mafia, working within the legal and ethical framework.

This is what terrifies the establishment--because as long as you remain ONLY a dope-cure program, like these halfway houses, there's no fear you'll cure any dope fiend, or solve any of the real problems that create them. You can't cure a Puerto Rican dope fiend and send him back to live in the South Bronx. If he's REALLY cured, he'd be the only sane man on his block, and this would drive him crazy.

The establishment and the right-wing nuts who control education and the textbook industry in this country, don't want poor people to realize what the Jew learned at the cost of thousands of dead and overworked bodies, what the Irish learned from the Molly Maguires hanging in their coalyards and battling the Boston Protestants, and what the Italian--who was further blocked because he was the last to come over--only began to realize through the instrument of organized crime.

> Delancey Street takes these ethnic models for success and places them on a multiracial and multiclass basis to perform the same functions as Tammany Hall and the Sons of Italy. This alarms the establishment, the social workers, the government bureaucrats, and the prison officials, because it means that their days are numbered.
>
> Second governments like this are common to the American experience. The Italian-American had been so dominated by the Mafia that it became a second government in urban 'Little Italy.' When I was a boy, my Irish clan whas much more afraid of the local political boss than of the police. In California and the Midwest of the early 1950s, the right-wing cranks formed a second government, and folks were a lot more worried about what they thought, than what the government thought. To change society, decent people have to build an alternative and protective structure in their neighborhoods.
>
> What is needed is the development of a new and INDIGENOUS philosophy to alleviate the injustices of the American state.

It is important to add that Maher's rehabilitation techniques include the devastating social and psychological tactics developed in Synanon to deal with ex-drug users. His program hardly "coddles" criminals. Indeed, it expects a higher level of community involvement from participants than society asks of ordinary citizens. They support the farm workers, help older adults, register voters, even run for political office. They also manage their own coffee house and are preparing to set up several businesses in the San Francisco area. Yet all of these projects presume that the criminal is as important as the victim to Maher - genuine justice requires that we all (and particularly the rich) assume some responsibility for helping to bring ex-offenders back into society on an equal footing.

These strategies, then, show us how corporate, liberal and religious theories of justice interact in the most basic debates over neighborhood security. The kind of program that a neighborhood organization develops to deal with crime, moreover, will both express and reinforce its commitment to one of these basic standards. The community that works to exclude potential offenders, "lower-class" individuals, will reinforce its common belief in standards of achievement, and the right to be left alone. It, then, may find it difficult to work out common agreements in other areas that violate this belief in privatism. Neighborhoods that confine themselves to crime prevention may gain a sense of security that comes from knowing that neighbors share a concern for problems of safety; but without asking why some people are harrassing others, they may never end the harrassment. A community that assumes the commitment asked by John Maher--a committment to help ex-offenders--assumes a much greater obligation, but may end up with a more lasting result. Mr. Maher's ex-convicts are becoming some of San Francisco's most constructive citizens. The real question for neighborhoods, then, is whether they are prepared to take the risks that the ideal strategy for justice might require.

Footnotes

1. Edward Banfield, The Unheavenly City Revisited, Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, pp. 234-36, 251-59.**

2. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, New York, Avon, 1975, pp. 120-21.

3. Grover Sales, John Maher of Delancey St., New York, W.W. Norton, 1976, pp. 53-55; 59-61; 62-27; 92-93; 95-97; 157-161. *

D. Questions for Discussion

1. Of the three strategies for security discussed in this session, which makes most sense to you: Banfield's proposal to remove "lower-class individuals from society until they can be reformed; The Crime Commission's support for efforts at community crime prevention; or Maher's program to rehabilitate ex-offenders? Which, if any, would it oppose?

2. What efforts is your neighborhood association making now to deal with issues of security? In what tradition of justice would these efforts fall? Would you say that these efforts are consistent with efforts that your neighborhood is making in other areas? How are they consistent?

3. If you wanted to persuade members of your community to shift its orientation to dealing with security, what community leaders would be most effective in making the case? Given what you know about their standards of justice, would they agree with you? Why or why not?

E. For Further Reading

The Unheavenly City Revisited. Edward Banfield, Boston, Little Brown & Co., 1974.

**Excerpts are printed from THE UNHEAVENLY CITY REVISITED, by Edward Banfield, with the permission of the publisher, Little, Brown and Co., Boston, Massachusetts. Copyright (c) 1968 by Edward Banfield.

*Excerpts are printed from JOHN MAHER OF DELANCEY STREET, A Guide to Peaceful Revolution in America, by Grover Sales, with the permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Co., Inc. New York, New York. Copyright (c) 1976 by Grover Sales.

A National Strategy to Reduce Crime.
National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards, and Goals, New York, Avon, 1975.

John Maher of Delancey Street. Grover Sales, New York, W.W. Norton, 1976.

What Americans Should do About Crime. L. Harold de Wolf, New York, Harper & Row, 1976.

Struggle for Justice. A Report on Crime and Punishment in America. Prepared for the American Friends Service Committee, New York, Hill and Wang, 1971.

UNIT VII: JUSTICE AND RECIPROCITY

A. The Justice of Reciprocity

To many people, reciprocity is justice. Certainly, when we think of the idea of fairness in society, notions of give-and-take, mutuality, compromise are among the first that come to us. In "Time to Weld the Bell," Jesse Jackson captures the concept in his descriptions of "proportional justice"--"you will reap what you sow"; and "reciprocal justice--an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Professor John Schaar's brief summary of Aristotle also describes what many Americans would call the justice characterized by reciprocity:

> (Aristotle believed) that the state cannot attain, and therefore should not aspire to attain, unity. He thought this was so because the state consists neither of one man nor of a body of identicals. Rather it consists of a body of different kinds of men. Therefore, he tells us, community requires different kinds of capacity, interest and character among its members. It does so because through the interplay of diversities, men are able to serve as compliments of one another and to attain a higher and better life by the mutual exchange of different services. (1.)

Yet both Reverend Jackson and Professor Schaar argue that this principle represents only a minimal standard of justice. To Reverend Jackson, "Divine justice, which has a sacrificial character," ought to be our ultimate goal. To Schaar, justice itself is "found perfectly in the formulation that men form communities not just to live, but to live a life of felicity and goodness." The rest of us accept these definitions when we talk about people who "fight for justice" in society. Here, we are thinking of idealists who work on behalf of "felicity and goodness" in the country whether or not they receive tangible rewards for their efforts. Genuine idealists urge us to believe that goodness is its own reward, regardless of other benefits that it may bring us.

Thus, we must subject reciprocity itself to the standard of justice. On what other basis, for example, are we to evaluate the demand from civic leaders that young people clean the sidewalks for nothing, as part of their service to the community? Is this a just demand? Or how are we to resolve the conflict between banks and urban residents over mortgage lending decisions in neighborhoods? The bankers claim that reciprocity to depositers requires them not to invest in low-income areas. Neighborhood leaders argue that many low-income and middle-income people are depositers too. Whose position is just? In a third area, when government offers tax incentives for business to remain in a city, corporate leaders call it reciprocity. Wage-earners call it an injustice, however, since they end up paying the entire public bill. Are the wage-earners right? The treatment of young people, bankers,

and businesses raise three of the most important problems of reciprocity that our neighborhoods face. It is critical to sort out the issues of justice involved in each of them.

B. Justice, Reciprocity, and Young People

As we have seen, community organizations face difficult problems in trying to develop a fair relationship with young people. The problems of youth--inadequate education; uncertain economic opportunities--may be beyond the ability of any one community to solve. This does not prevent young people from venting their frustrations on the neighborhood itself, however, through vandalism, harassment, and crime. Many organizations form to protect themselves against this sort of behavior, and most people would support them. The difficulty arises in determining how a group can work for justice for young people, while instilling attitudes of justice in them.

As a starting point, we must come to grips with the basic reciprocity contract that we ask our children to accept. We tell them that three institutions will prepare them for society --the family, the school, and the church. We say that if they follow the rules established by these institutions, they eventually will find jobs adequate to meet their needs. Their responsibility is to follow the rules.

When young people begin to break the rules, community organizations usually place all the blame on them. Is this a fair response, however? A reciprocity contract works both ways. While the neighborhood as a whole may not assume responsibility to child-raising, it certainly has entrusted this responsibility to certain community agencies. Wouldn't justice require community leaders to examine whether these agencies can fulfill their tasks by themselves, before deciding that the young people have broken their side of the agreement without cause?

Reverend Jesse Jackson of Operation PUSH is trying to promote just this sort of reciprocity between young people and society in every major city. The following article in the Washington Post summarizes his approach.

Making Johnny Learn
William Raspberry (2.)

It took a little while to see where Reverend Jesse Jackson was headed.

"This might break a favorite habit of yours," he told the Tuesday morning assembly at Dunbar High School just as he started his honors day talk, "but since the place has a roof on it, and since it's warm in here--why don't you young men just take your hats off."

There was some giggling, some applause (particularly from the teachers and parents who were there) and some embarrassment. But every last hat came off, and the director of Operation PUSH, the former lieutenant of Martin Luther King, the Chicago-based "Country Preacher," was in control.

The control was absolutely vital to his secondary mission here--getting young black people to develop the self-respect and discipline he believes is necessary for their academic success. (His primary mission is the running of a revival at the 19th Street Baptist Church and helping to launch a Washington affiliate of People United to Save Humanity--PUSH.)

This fiery phrasemaker, ostensible radical and revolutionary is revealing himself as a thorough-going conservative with and abiding--and infectious--faith in the old values. He also is showing that he understands the value of symbols, of which doffing hats is one.

Mr. Jackson has spent this week visiting high schools around the city, talking to students not about revolution but about their responsibilities as civilized human beings.

In a between-sessions interview in his hotel room, he likened himself--not quite so immodestly as it sounds--to a Moses just arrived in Canaan.

"You know, when the Israelites got close to Canaan and the physical struggle was over, they turned to worshipping the Golden Calf, fighting among themselves and generally lost the sense of what they were about. Moses had to risk his popularity by going to the mountain top, not for a bigger budget but for Ten Commandments of ethics by which civilized people live. It was a prophetic thing he did.

"Well, that's where we are now in the struggle. You can talk black and be popular, you can argue for a bigger budget and more concessions and be politic, or you be prophetic and say what needs to be said."

And what needs to be said he summarizes in the formula he repeats at every opportunity: "Nobody will save us from us--but us."

He won't call them Commandments, but Mr. Jackson has been espousing ten points which he believes will lead to the restoration of discipline and academic excellence in the public schools, here and in urban centers across the land.

I won't list them here, but their essence is self-respect and self-

control.

He expressed shock, for instance, at the presence of uniformed police officers in some of the schools and told the student athletes (his emphasis is always on the boys) that they should assume it is their job to become "peace brothers" for the maintenance of discipline in their schools.

He repeats many of his points during the revival sessions because he believes that churchgoing parents may be important as "the institutional group capable of sustaining something past the moment."

One of his notions is that, for at least a year, report cards should not be sent home with the students but that parents should be required to come to school to pick them up and to discuss their children's educational progress, "If the parents don't show up we ought to send a citizen's equivalent of the truant officer to go looking for them."

This civil rights radical is conservative enough to believe that one source of the discipline problem in the schools is that the schools are too informal. As a remedy, he would institute regular fall and winter convocations at every high school (shirts and ties for students, full academic regalia for teachers).

Principals could take advantage of the convocations and their state-of-the-school messages to extract pledges that "If I have to take your children's hats or dice or cards, or if I take their radios and sell them and put the money in the senior class treasury, I won't have to fight you in court."

He would have the mayor and city council proclaim weekdays getween 7 and 9 p.m. as a "citywide study hour" as a means of helping parents to tear their children away from their TV sets. "And somewhere around 10:30 ought to be bedtime," he declares.

"If Johnny can't learn because he is hungry, that's the fault of poverty. But if Johnny can't pay attention because he's sleepy, that's the fault of parents."

He would enlist fathers for regular school patrol duty and demand that radio disk jockeys "assume another level of responsibility since they program more of our children's minds than their parents and teachers."

And he would have everybody abandon the rhetoric that leads black youths to see themselves as society's victims rather than as human beings with the capability of controlling their own destinies.

"What urban education needs is not more money but more parents willing to give their children care, motivation and chastisement --the will to learn" he declared.

"Do that, and these other things will become less of an issue --things like budgets, or such nonsense as black children can't learn from white teachers."

Neighborhood leaders who agree with Reverend Jackson can begin to examine a reciprocity program for young people themselves. For example--we assume that families will undertake the major burden of raising children. Do neighborhood conditions permit families to assume this responsibility, however? Are there adequate jobs for all parents who need work? Are there decent child-care facilities for women whose jobs remove them from the home during the day? In previous generations, all members of a family lived in the neighborhood--aunts and uncles as well as parents. If one member of the family had a problem, others in the family would help solve it. Do families live together like this in neighborhoods today? If not, what provisions does the community organization make for families that face difficulties? When a young person begins to cause trouble in the neighborhood, do the neighbors ask the parents what they might do to help? Or do they complain amongst themselves and wonder why the parents can't "control" their children? These are basic questions that a community organization ought to ask before assuming that young people are exclusively to blame.

Community organizations often complain about the schools, but do they ever ask how they might help to improve the quality of education? Not all teachers are angels, but no teacher can reach a student without some support from the parents. It is for this reason that schools support the Home and School Associations and the PTA. Do these organizations operate within the neighborhood? If not, is the community association making efforts to meet with teachers and principals on its own to determine what kind of assistance the schools need? When did the last meeting between community residents and teachers take place? If no such meetings have taken place, how can community residents even understand what's happening in the schools, let alone do something about it?

Young people will not even attend a church or synagogue without support from the parents. Parents, in turn, will not take religious commitment seriously in the absence of a community that encourages it. What does the neighborhood do to support its various religious institutions? As important, what does the community association do to encourage discussion of basic values among the people of the neighborhood? Has the association worked to involve religious leaders in its activities? Has it ever introduced the kind of neighborhood social contracts that we have discussed in these sessions? Again, if the community has not taken direct responsibility for reinforcing the institutions entrusted with preserving higher values, should we be surprised when young people don't take the values seriously either?

Finally, to what extent is the community association working to guarantee the kind of future that we promise our young people in exchange for their obedience? We tell children that if they work hard, attend school, do as they're told, they'll get a decent job for themselves and their families. How does the community organization respond, then, when the unemployment rate rises to 12% or higher? Does it assume no responsibility for demanding full employment, or does it join in various public campaigns for jobs? If neighborhood residents don't work actively for jobs, how can families and schools persude young people that work will be available for them when they graduate? If we promise economic opportunity in exchange for responsible behavior, should we be surprised when irresponsible behavior occurs in economic hardship? While no one community organization can create full employment, a young person might reasonably ask how each organization is contributing to the effort.

Thus, establishing reciprocity contracts with young people may really require a commitment to justice from neighborhood residents and institutions themselves. Indeed, creating a future for our children suggests the most powerful practical reason for us to care about ideal justice in the neighborhoods. If we assume that we don't owe anything to one another--that families. schools, and churches can give direction to young people in the absence of community cooperation and support--we may end up paralyzing these institutions for want of support. If, in turn, we believe that a few political and business leaders will create full employment without continuing public pressure, we may discover that our own sons and daughters will be unable to find work when they graduate. Young people are unsure of themselves. They expect us to be consistent. When we promise them a livelihood in exchange for obedience and hard work, they expect us to deliver. If the promise is just, we owe it to them to take this sort of justice seriously. That is what a just reciprocity contract requires.

C. Justice, Reciprocity, and Economic Institutions

The task of creating economic justice for young people leads us directly to the responsibility of economic institutions to the neighborhoods. In the session on reciprocity, we saw that community residents and businesses make claims upon one another that political leaders must resolve. The community may expect industry to adhere to environmental standards, to hire local workers, to pay its fair share of the tax burden, and to contribute to city activities. Industry may expect the community to support needed public services, to provide a trained work force, and to insure adequate standards of security around the plants. When each side respects the claim of the other, then just reciprocity contracts are possible. When the businesses assume that the community exists to support them, however, then serious issues of justice arise.

Two of the most flagrant examples in the past decade have been the practices of redlining and urban disinvestment on the part of banks. Although the two practices are often confused, they are not exactly the same. Redlining is the policy of drawing a red line around a neighborhood for some specific reason and refusing to invest in it. Sometimes redlining occurs in response to racial change in a neighborhood. Sometimes, it occurs because of economic and social conditions in the neighborhood independent of race. Either way, it can insure the death of the community involved.

Urban disinvestment always takes place as a result of redlining, but it may take place for other reasons as well. The term means exactly what it says--disinvestment of funds from an urban area to other kinds of communities. The city may not be redlined. The bank may still grant a few mortgages here and there. Yet gradually it is removing the bulk of investments from the urban neighborhoods to the suburbs or to other parts of the country. Of course, the capital acquired to make these investments has come from the original depositers in the city. Yet for various reasons, the bankers have chosen to ignore these depositers in their pursuit of more lucrative investment elsewhere.

Redlining in response to racial change is not only immoral, it is probably illegal under the Fair Housing Act of 1968. Courts in Cincinnati already have ruled to this effect in response to a suit, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has held hearings to identify similar practices elsewhere. Thus, if a community organization believes that its neighborhood is redlined because of race, it need go no further than the courts to establish the justice of their claim.

The knottier issues of reciprocity revolve around redlining and urban disinvestment for reasons other than race. To bankers, reciprocity requires only that the banks give decent interest rates to their depositers. Thus, they argue that mortgage investment in unsafe neighborhoods, in low-income neighborhoods, in neighborhoods where the housing stock is deteriorating constitutes an unwise use of their depositers' savings. While a few politicians are now demanding that the private sector assume the major responsibility for solving our social and economic problems, these representatives of the private sector are quite willing to pass the burden back to the government.

Community organizations in various cities, however, have won widespread support for the idea that a bank that receives most of its capital from depositers in a neighborhood owes something to the neighborhood as a whole, not merely to each individual depositer. After all, what good does 6% return on a person's savings do if his neighborhood is going to pot? Even if urban disinvestment is not always the first cause of this decline, it invariably accelerates the process. Realtors warn prospective homebuyers to stay away from the neighborhood, it is redlined. Simultaneously, realtors and mortgage bankers anxious to pick up new clients en-

tice low-income residents with large families to purchase homes, no money down, on FHA insured loans--even when they have no idea what home maintenance costs and when the community is not prepared for a large influx of young people. Neighborhoods certainly do deteriorate rapidly in response to these developments, but by the time the process is complete, the banks already have reinvested and perhaps even relocated to the suburbs.

A recent federal disclosure act requiring banks to reveal locations of their mortgage activity by zip code and census tract will help community leaders determine whether urban disinvestment is taking place. By itself, however, the data will not prove that redlining is taking place, let alone illegal redlining. A community organization will have to correlate the mortgage activity with other trends in the neighborhood--racial change, economic change, shift in public services. This process will not be impossible, groups in Cincinnati did it--but it will be difficult. The banks, moreover, will be hiring researchers and attorneys of their own to defend themselves.

Community activists in some areas, therefore, have tried to dramatize the ethical issue of reciprocity through a tactic known as greenlining. It is a form of economic boycott, in some ways parallel to a strike. If workers prove their worth to a company by withdrawing their labor, neighborhood organizers attempt to prove the collective value of depositers to banks by persuading them to remove their savings. When well organized, greenlining campaigns solicit participation not only from individual depositers, but from institutional depositers--churches, even city governments--as well. They aim at getting press attention for their efforts and support from major public leaders. If, finally, the banks do agree to grant mortgages to all qualified applicants, then the organizers usually insist upon an advertising campaign by the bank to this effect as a guarantee of good faith.

Mr. Robert Creamer, a coordinator of the Chicago Citzens' Action Program, outlines how a greenlining campaign can operate.

Organizing Money
by Robert Creamer (3.)

INTRODUCTION

In the last year, the Chicago based Citizens Action Program (CAP) Congress of Community Organizations has pioneered a new organizing technique that gives local community organizations the ability to permanently appropriate considerable power over the future of their neighborhoods.

This technique is rooted in the understanding that the decisions that most significantly affect the state of communities are financial. They are investment decisions made by Savings & Loans, Banks, insurance companies, large land developers and realtors.

Simply put, the strategy involves the recruitment of thousands of pledges from community residents that they will allow financial institutions to have access to their savings deposits only if they use these deposits to shape the community according to their desires. This procedure, known as "greenlining" was originally developed to deal with mortgage redlining, whereby institutions arbitrarily withdraw mortgage capital from certain communities.

THE DISINVESTMENT PROBLEM

Thousands of people in Chicago invest savings every year in local Banks and Savings & Loans. Over 13 billion dollars are invested in Savings & Loans alone and these dollars provide the bulk of mortgage financing in the Chicago area.

For years, Banks and Savings & Loans have had a free hand to determine exactly where money would be invested--regardless of the needs of the communities from which they get their savings. The result has been a net outflow of housing capital from the older neighborhoods of the City, and a virtual bleeding dry of mortgage capital from neighborhoods threatened with racial instability.

Frequently, financial institutions have engaged in the practice of overt redlining--drawing a red line around communities where they have decided to curtail or completely cut off new investment. Areas that are solid, viable communities are often redlined because mortgage institutions decide that in the long run they are "bad risks." However, this becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Without mortgage funds, home improvement loans, and commercial loans, the community does, in fact, deteriorate.

Of course, the result of this practice in racially changing areas can be complete re-segregation. When conventional mortgage money is withdrawn from a changing area, panic sets in. Since potential buyers and sellers cannot get anything but FHA insured mortgages, the door is opened for unscrupulous mortgage bankers and panic peddlers to completely turn over huge areas using several much abused sections of the FHA housing laws. The result is millions of dollars in profits for mortgage banking firms, and realtors; but it is also the loss of thousands of dollars in property values to current and former residents, the exploitation of thousands of new buyers who pay exorbitant prices, huge rates of home abandonment, and enormous racial hatred.

Disinvestment, however, may take more subtle forms. In periods of tight money there simply isn't as much mortgage money to go around. So older neighborhoods that didn't get much moeny when credit was abundant, don't get any when it is scarce.

During the first nine months of 1974, thousands of potential city home buyers were told that mortgages were unavailable because money was tight, or that 50-60% downpayments would be necessary. And money certainly was tight. The 1.3 billion dollars in conventional

mortgages made in the Chicago area over that period was considerably under the amount made in the same period in 1973. Yet, the fact remains that loans were made. And most of them were made in the far suburbs and in condominium developments along the posh lakefront. Throughout this period, homes and developments were continually advertised in these areas at low interest rates and 5-10% downpayments.

In other words, the limited amount of money that was available was all going outside of the communities that generated savings. One of the major causes of this phenomenon is the process whereby Savings and Loans give large package forward commitments to big developers six months or a year before mortgage money is needed. Through this procedure, large suburban developers get all of the money they need before the individual home buyer even gets to enter the market.

Other disinvestment techniques are commonplace. Some institutions will not give mortgages on frame houses-even though all of some neighborhoods are frame. Or, institutions will not give mortgages on less than 35 foot lots, even though huge areas of cities have smaller than 35 foot lots .

THE GREENLINING RESPONSE

In facing the problem of neighborhood deterioration, the Citizens Action Program has developed a systematic response--a strategy for forcing financial institutions to meet their obligations to the communities where they get their savings. This strategy, known as "greenlining" involves organizing the savers' dollars through pledges. Savers pledge to invest savings only in institutions which agree to shoulder their share of the mortgage demand in the community. These pledges are then used as the basis to negotiate contractural agreements with lending institutions for specific levels of reinvestment into the community. The agreements are renewable on a yearly basis.

Currently, over $50 million in pledges has been recruited from over 13,000 people in Chicago. These pledges were collected over a six month period through canvassing in local neighborhoods and recruitment through churches and other institutions. Individual community organizations which are members of the CAP Anti-Deterioration Coalition are now entering into negotiations with financial institutions for contracts. Simultaneously, the citywide coalition is beginning discussions with downtown Savings & Loans.

The target date for the completion of the first major organizing drive is April 6, 1975--the date of the citywide CAP Congress Convention. At that point, the 4,000 delegates will determine a strategy for enforcing these agreements. The Convention will determine which institutions will be targeted as examples of those which have failed to sign contracts, and pledge signers will be asked to move their savings from those institutions to others which have come to terms.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS ALLOWING FOR THE SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION OF THE GREENLINING STRATEGY

Obviously any strategy involving the organization of money will only succeed if the amount of money which it is possible to organize is adequate to seriously affect target institutions. Several circumstances have allowed for the success to date of the Chicago Greenlining drive:

1. It is not necessary when dealing with financial intermediaries such as Banks or Savings & Loans to organize a substantial portion of the total assets of any given institutions or the industry as a whole. Rather the organization must gain control only over a large percentage of the institutions liquid assets for some limited time period. About 17% of the assets of the average Savings & Loan are liquid in any given year (or about 4.25% for any quarter). If a high percentage of the pledges of savers in target institutions can actually be implemented over a quarter, then the amount of pledges needed to seriously affect the institution need not be terribly high.

The current credit shortage--particularly in mortgage capital--has increased the power of savers to affect institutions with a limited number of pledges. Of course, for a $100 million institution, 5% of total institutional assets still represents $5 million in pledges from about 1250 pledgess (the average savings account in the Chicago area is about $4,000),

2. Throughout Illinois there is sharp and constant competition for savings among institutions since chartering practices are relatively liberal. This gives potential savers a variety of options among a number of relatively convenient institutions, so that the pledgee is more willing to move his or her savings from one institution to another. In some states, like Michigan, chartering practices are considerably more restrictive and competition is therefore less pronounced.

3. The withdrawal of savings accounts from Savings & Loans is a fairly simple and uncostly proposition from the standpoint of the saver-pledgee. Savings & Loan accounts are, of course, passbook accounts and are therefore less withdrawable than bank demand deposits, but they are still easy enough to withdraw to make the threat credible. The percentage of pledgees who actually implement their pledges is maximized by concentrating on a few target institutions as examples and following up on all pledges in these institutions through mail and personal contact.

Also the ease of transfer is increased because forms are available which allow the transfer of funds from one Savings and Loan to another entirely by mail.

Most importantly, of course, savers are not being asked to remove their savings so rapidly that they will lose any interest. A principle requisite of all money organizing strategies is to assure that it will cost the participants as little as possible in the short run.

4. The managements of Savings & Loans and Banks--particularly at the neighborhood level are deeply concerned that once a highly publicized program asking pledgees to move their savings from the institution were initiated, many other non-pledgee savers would jump on the bandwagon. As a result they fear that they might lose deposits far in excess of the amoung pledged. While organizations should not depend on this effect for their bargaining power, it certainly does increase the credibility of the greenlining tactic.

5. Illinois law has historically prevented the development of a few dominant chain Banks or Savings & Loans with many branches. People therefore have a sense of many Banks and Savings & Loans as neighborhood institutions. Residents are able to love or hate specific neighborhood institutions much more than they would love or hate the neighborhood office of a faceless metropolitan-wide Bank.

6. In each neighborhood where the pledge drive has been conducted, the drive itself had been preceded by other types of activities geared toward making the residents aware of the redlining issue. In many areas this included a year long campaign for disclosure of lending information, confrontation of savings and loan officials, public hearings, and demonstrations. Of course, as the issue has become better understood throughout the city, less lead time has become necessary to kick off specific community drives.

Other areas which adopt the greenlining approach might not have exactly the same list of conditions as Chicago. Certainly most areas in Illinois are very similar. But one thing should always be kept in mind: before adopting any money organizing strategy, a serious analysis should be undertaken to find out just how much money is needed to have an impact, and whether the organization has the ability to recruit that number of pledges.

FORMULATING DEMANDS

For a campaign of the type described above to prevent disinvestment, contract demands must be carefully developed and ironclad. The following is an outline of the demand formulation.

Determining Mortgage Demand for a Given Area

Cook County maintains precise records of yearly home turnover and market price for each of 400 neighborhoods throughout the country. This data (supplemented by census data and data from the Society of Real Estate Appraisers SREA) allows CAP to determine exactly how much money is needed to finance the home sales that occur each year in each community.

Defining the Community Area

Each organization determines exactly how to define its own area. Neighboring areas crucial to community stability, as well as subareas vulnerable to deterioration are specifically designated.

Determining How Much of the Demand in Each Area Given Institution Should Meet

First, the dollar demand in the community will be divided between each institution in the market area in proportion to the assets of each institution. The bigger the institution, the more money it would be asked to put back into the neighborhood.

Secondly, a rider is attached to each local agreement to the effect that their proportion of reinvestment in the immediate community could be reduced in direct proportion to the number of agreements CAP can get from the central area Savings & Loans. These central area (downtown) Savings & Loans control about 20% of the assets in the metropolitan area and should shoulder the responsibility for 20% of the demand in each geographic area. But there is no guarantee at the beginning of negotiations that they will do so. Therefore, CAP demands that all demands be met by the local area institutions to help get agreements with the downtown institutions. This procedure, of course, could be modified where a high proportion of savings from an area goes to downtown institutions.

Determining Which Financial Institutions Are in Each Local Market Area

The institutions included in local market areas are chosen mainly on the basis that they get a great deal of savings from the community.

Determining How Much Mortgage Money Should be Made Available By Banks

Banks, unlike Savings & Loans, do not make most of their investment in real estate loans. In some communities (like the southwest side), they meet virtually none of the mortgage demand. In others, they make considerably more. On the average the Federal Reserve Board indicates that Banks make approximately 5.6% of their total assets available for home mortgages.

At a minimum CAP demands that every Bank CAP considers important make at least this percentage of its total assets available for mortgages.

To determine the proportion of demand in a community that a bank should shoulder, CAP treats a $100 million Bank that did not make any mortgages at all like $5.6 million Savings & Loan. Where a $100 million Bank puts 20% of its assets into mortgages, CAP treats it like a $20 million dollar Savings & Loan. In other words, a $100 million Savings and Loan would be expected to shoulder five times more mortgage demand than a $100 million Bank that puts 20% of its assets into mortgages.

Before beginning negotiations with banks, however, CAP is developing other additional demands for redevelopment funds, small business loans, and home improvement loans--since this is the area in which the bank would be most likely to contribute to the welfare of the neighborhoods.

Is CAP Asking Only That a Financial Institution Make Mortgages "Available" to the Community?

No, CAP is asking that the institution actually invest a specific

dollar amount in the community over the period of one year. The local organization knows how much demand there is for mortgages in each area. The Savings & Loan or Bank cannot argue that there isn't enough demand in an area to support the dollar figure it has requested. This is especially true in this period of tight mortgage money.

Additional Demands

Aside from the basic demand that the institutions meet conventional mortgage demand in neighborhoods, several other elements are included in any contract or agreement CAP negotiates:

-Affirmative Lending Policy. Each institution is required to invest the same number of advertising dollars in informing the neighborhood of the availability of home mortgages as they spend trying to generate savings from the community.

-Terms. The average downpayment, nominal interest rate, effective interest rate (after points, etc.) and length of term fall within very close limits to the averages for all mortgages made in the six county area. The Federal Home Loan Bank Economics Department maintains public records of these averages.

-Redevelopment. In each local area, organizations may wish to add specific dollar demands, over and above normal conventional loan demand, for money that would go into redevelopment programs.

Other Provisions

It is necessary to include clauses in any agreement with the financial institutions which allow an adjustment-either up or down-of actual dollars to be invested in a community in the event that after six months of the year long agreement, the records of the Cook County Recorder of Deeds. This could easily be incorporated in any contract.

Examples of Possible Damnds by Specific Organizations on Specific Savings and Loan Associations

Southwest Federation: Demand $24,663,518

Savings & Loan	Savings From Primary Service Area	%	$Share of Demand	Actual Invest.
Talman	$329,499,654	64.1	$15,809,315	$5,828,230
Chicago Savings	53,254,833	10.3	2,540,342	
Gage Park	12,732,248	2.4	591,924	399,280
Republic Feder.	53,508,872	10.4	2,565,005	
Crawford	41,676,734	8.1	1,997,744	
Lawn Manor	9,880,000	1.9	468,606	
SW Federal	13,134,382	2.5	616,587	
TOTAL	$513,686,723	100.0	$24,663,518	

North Austin: Demand $12,995,104

Savings & Loan	Assets	%	$Share of Demand
Austin Federal	$ 87,243,806	23.2	$ 3,041,864
St. Paul	233,369,502	62.2	8,082,954
1st Fed. S&L of Schaumburg	13,133,187	3.4	441,833

Sterling	$ 41,422,320	11.0	1,429,461
TOTAL	$375,168,815	99.8	$12,995,104

Monitoring the Agreements

Each institution must agree to provide quarterly, CPA verified disclosure of lending and savings distribution. Geographic areas broken out by the institution must be specific enough to assure that the agreement is being complied with.

Disclosure for this monitoring should include: dollar amount and number of both loans and savings deposits for each geographic area covered by the agreement, for other areas of the city not covered by the agreement, and for the suburbs; nominal and effective interest rates by area; downpayment and length of term by area; dollar amounts spent on advertising intended to attract savings in the area and that which is intended to inform the community of the availability of mortgage loans in the community.

POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS OF MONEY ORGANIZING STRATEGIES

The greenlining strategy is significant because it recognizes that the forces which shape the future of neighborhoods are primarily economic-not racial, and to a large extent not even political. Through the greenlining project, and other related projects to reform FHA, CAP has been successful at uniting white and black community groups-even in changing neighborhoods-against the common enemies of those communities: large financial institutions.

Just as important, however, the greenlining concept could very well provide the same kind of power for community organizing that the strike weapon has provided the labor movement. It gives people the ability to organize the capital generated by their savings and allows its use only for purposes which serve their interests.

So far this type of organized money power has been used mainly to assure that demand for mortgage funds are met in communities. The most immediate extension of the program would be to assure that home improvement loans, commercial loans to small businessmen and redevelopment loans for specific projects are available.

Developing specific dollar demands in these areas is a much more subjective process and will require research on a community by community basis.

The policies of various other institutions which affect communities could also be addressed using this technique. For instance, many insurance companies discriminate against certain areas in their rate structure. It is possible that programs might be developed to organize insurance consumers in the area and to give business only to companies which give the community favorable treatment.

Adaptations of money organizing in other areas must, of course, be done quite carefully, and systematically. The specific program must make sense to potential pledgees and the economics of the industry or institution in question must be such that the potentially organ-

izable money can have an impact.

The investment policies of some institutions - including insurance companies and mortgage bankers - are not of course so immediately subject to the type of savings organizing described above. The possibility of affecting even these institutions, however, should not be set aside as organizing of this sort expands around the country.

The organization of a community's capital resources could be a fundamental new departure in community organizing. If it works, real community control over a number of the decisions that affect neighborhoods may be a real possibility.

It does not require much thought to recognize the obstacles to this sort of campaign. If a state prohibits branch banking, the a neighborhood at least knows that its deposits constitute the entire source of the local Savings and Loan Association's capital. If the banks can establish branches, however, then greenlining will work only if the community's deposits do represent a sizeable portion of the bank's income. Banks that already have disinvested and relocated from the cities are unlikely targets for greenlining, even if their capital did come from urban neighborhoods originally.

The ultimate obstacle, however, may lie with the neighborhood residents themselves. If institutions relating to young people cannot inspire justice in young people without community support, most economic institutions will not grant justice to neighborhoods without community pressure. Just as strikes require unity among workers, so greenlining campaigns require unity among neighbors. They must share a standard of justice that asks each person, each institution to take seriously the good of the whole. Residents who refuse to accept this principle, in effect, are agreeing with the banks and all other businesses that argue that the market itself creates a just distribution of the wealth. There is a sort of justice in this position, the sort that Andrew Carnegie urged upon America. As long as neighborhood residents are willing to abide it, they will have to accept what they get, whether or not they think they deserve it.

D. Justice, Reciprocity and Urban Government

The issue of reciprocity between economic institutions and citizens extends beyond their private dealings to principles of government itself. By now, most Americans are familiar with federal tax loopholes that permit large corporations and wealthy individuals to pay almost no taxes at all. They may not realize that federal taxable income is the basis for all local taxation as well.

Thus, national loopholes are passed along to the local level.

Urban governments add to these tax advantages by offering tax benefits of their own. A state or city may exempt investment income from taxes imposed on wage-earnings. Real estate assessors may adopt a double standard for estimating the value of industrial property and homeowners' property. Large stockholders may pay no taxes at all on their investment portfolios, even though a "property" tax used to apply to all property, not merely homes.

Bill Callahan, Director of the Philadelphia-based Taxpayer's information Project, outlines how and why the inequities occur.

How Much People Make in Pennsylvania: Or, Who's Middle Class, Anyway?

by Bill Callahan
Taxpayers Information Project (4.)

One of the commonest assumptions about America is that the majority of Americans are "middle class"--that is, relatively affluent, with some money in the bank, a house, a car, and an income level which is vague but hovers in the vicinity of $12,000 to $25,000 a year. While the part about the house and car may be true, the "middle class income" is a myth--as demonstrated by the following:

According to 1970 census figures, families in Pennsylvania broke down (according to income) according to the following rough fifths--

Bottom fifth	below $6000
second fifth	between $6000 and about $8500
middle fifth	between $8500 and $11,000
fourth "	between $11,000 and $15,000
top fifth	$15,000 and up

The "median family income" in Pennsylvania in 1970--the level which had as many families above it as below it--was $9,558. This was about $1000 below what the Bureau of Labor Statistics called a "moderate budget" for a family of four.

All these figures have gone up by about a thousand dollars in the last four years (the cost of living has gone up faster). But even allowing for a steeper rise, the fact is that THE MAJORITY OF PENNSYLVANIA FAMILIES--AT LEAST TWO-THIRDS--STILL MAKE LESS THAN $15,000 A YEAR. And if we take individuals without families into account--which we must, since they constitute one out of every four households--then of the total taxpaying units in Pennsylvania, at least four-fifths make less than $15,000 a year, and two-thirds probably make less than $12,000.

So, if there's a "broad middle class", it logically includes--on the basis of income--families making between $6,000 and $15,000 a year. People making more are at least in the "upper middle class"--which unfortunately (for them) sounds a lot worse when you're discussing tax breaks. And those with incomes of $25,000 or more are among the top 5% of the population.

These are important facts to keep in mind when examining the impact of the tax system. The recent defeat of the New Jersey income tax was due, at least in part, to the mistaken idea that the "broad middle class" (that is, the majority of hard-working, taxpaying citizens) was going to be hurt by the measure. The notion that the $20,000-a-year doctor or other professional is a "little guy" in terms of income--that such taxpayers represent the interest of MOST taxpayers--is politically useful for opponents of progressive taxes, but it just isn't true.

The real "middle class" family may have a house (but it's mortgaged) and a car (two or three years old and still not paid for). They may even have a little money saved, although that's less and less likely. But they definately do NOT have an interest in holding onto a regressive tax system based on flat-rate taxes, breaks for capital gains, or taxes on consumer items and residential property.

THE TOTAL BURDEN OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES IN PENNA. IS REGRESSIVE...

% of Income paid by family of four, Philadelphia

Income	% paid
$ 5,000	10.2%
7,500	9.8
10,000	9.9
15,000	9.8
20,000	9.1
25,000	8.8

(Source: District of Columbia study of 25 largest American cities, 1972)

PROPERTY TAXES

The tax on real estate is regressive. Poor people pay more.

Lower income people pay a higher percentage of their income for housing than do higher income people. The Governor's Committee on Tax Reform estimates that people with incomes of $5,000-$7,000 pay 6% of their incomes in real estate tax, while families with incomes of $10,000-$15,000 pay 4.3%. These figures include tenants, who almost pay the entire real estate tax cost, hidden in their rent.

The Federal Government allows you to deduct property taxes from your income tax. But again, this helps higher income people more than lower income people. The Federal tax deduction has the effect of reducing property taxes by 18% for people with incomes of $25,000, but by only 9% for people with incomes of $5,000-$7,000. And tenants are not allowed to deduct the property tax they pay at all.

Beyond the overall regressivity of the property tax, it is applied in a way that INCREASES THE BURDEN OF LOW AND MIDDLE INCOME PEOPLE. This occurs in several ways:

1.) Real estate in Philadelphia is not assessed equally. Residential assessments in Philadelphia range from 40% or less in some areas, to 65% or more in others. The official rate is $65%. Most of the areas assessed at higher levels are low and middle income neighborhoods. The TEA party has estimated that if all buildings were assessed at a uniform 60% (5¢ lower than the present official rate) $40 million in additional property taxes would be raised. If the city didn't need $40 million, then all taxes could be cut.

Another solution to this problem would be to raise all assessments to a uniform 100% of fair market value. This would make it more difficult for favoritism, political payoffs, etc., to operate, since simple full value is much easier to understand, and check out, than percentage ratios.

2.) As the leaflet reproduced shows, center city buildings owned by large corporations often get special property tax breaks. Unlike some tax breaks openly and deliberately granted to induce business to relocate in a given community (and which are themselves of questionable value in producing the intended result) these tax breaks are just favors done by the assessors for large corporations.

3.) Some real property is tax exempt. 28% of all property in the city of Philadelphia is exempt from property taxes. While this situation is not as bad as it is in some cities (for example, in Boston, one half of all property is owned by tax exempt institutions), it does amount to more than a quarter of all property in the city, and raises everybody else's property taxes to make up for lost funds. This tax exempt property includes churches and schools. It also includes other property held by educational institutions, such as University of Pennsylvania Dormitories and labs--and ALL land held by the Redevelopment Authority. Some of the latter houses going businesses, which pay no property tax.

4.) Property includes more than real estate. But only real estate is taxed under the property tax. Other kinds of property are taxed at much lower rates, or not at all. In the United States today, individuals, corporations, etc., hold about $7 trillion worth of assets (property). But only $1.4 trillion is taxed by current property taxes. The rest is taxed at much lower rates. For example, there is a .4% tax on stocks and bonds in Pennsylvania, versus a 4.47% tax on real estate, ten times as much. Further, income producing industrial machinery, such as the oil refineries in Eastwick, are consid-

ered personal property and are not subject to any local property tax.

Obviously, middle income people who own any property are likely to own a house, and less likely to own thousands of dollars worth of stocks and bonds. Wealthy people, while they may own a house or houses, may also have a large amount of money invested in other kinds of property like stocks and bonds. This property, unlike your home, produces income for these individuals, yet is taxed at a much lower rate.

This has contributed to the much greater disparity in the distribution of wealth than in the distribution of income that exists in America today.

The property tax burden must also be considered in light of services given back to the taxpayer. Unequal wealth in different parts of the country means that taxpayers in poor areas, who might be paying at a very high tax rate relative to their incomes, will still have fewer services returned than taxpayers in extremely wealthy areas. In other words, taxpayers in Appalachia might pay a higher percentage of their incomes in taxes than taxpayers in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Yet, the schools in Montgomery County will have more to spend on each child, because the tax base thereis higher than it is in Appalachia. The only solution to this problem would be some kind of Federal distribution of property taxes collected.

Interestingly enough, urban mayors not only do not apologize for these inequities, they brag about them. In an era when multinational corporations can control whole countries, let alone cities, low taxes have become part of the price a city pays for keeping its businesses within its borders. The idea is that private industry offers reciprocity to people merely by existing--by providing jobs, income, and a tax base from the individual employees. They owe the cities almost nothing else in return.

Even if urban residents are not happy with this arrangement, most show little inclination to resist it. While there have been various campaigns to prevent tax increases on homeowners and wage-earners, there have been few similar campaigns to force businesses to pay their fair share of local revenues. In many instances, of course, citizens don't know exactly what benefits industry receives. Even when they do know, however, most are reluctant to speak out against them. They, too, are afraid that businesses will merely leave, taking their job opportunities with them.

Whether a community organization can promote a respect for a standard of justice that emphasizes our mutual obligations to one another while it tolerates a system of taxation that permits almost every advantage to the rich remains to be seen. Certainly, millions of ordinary citizens begin with the tax system when they want to prove that the system is weighted against them. Again, the question is whether they are prepared to unite behind a standard of justice that would force everyone to pay their fair share--a

kind of reciprocity that our tax system has consistently ignored.

E. Conclusion

Reciprocity means give-and-take. It is always a higher standard than rugged individualism and greed, since it involves some adjustment between two parties. Yet we have seen that the fairest adjustment depends upon our commitment to a standard of ideal justice. We cannot expect our young people to respect neighborhood rules unless we deliver on the just promises that we make to them. We cannot expect banks and businesses to honor economic justice unless we are prepared to enforce the standard through our own collective action. We cannot expect government to adopt a just system of taxation and urban financing unless we demand it. Since these are three of the most important issues facing our communities, we may begin to recognize how critical the idea of justice is in general. The survival of the neighborhoods, in fact, may depend on it.

Footnotes

1.) John Schaar, op. cit. p. 27.

2.) William Raspberry, "Making Johnny Learn," Washington Post, January 30, 1976.

3.) Robert Creamer, "Organizing Money," Public Policy Reader, Derek Shearer & Lee Webb, eds., (Washington, Institute for Policy Studies, 1975.)

4.) Bill Callahan, "Fair Taxation with Real Representation," published by the Tax Equity for America Party, Philadelphia.

F. Questions for Discussion

1. To what extent can families, schools, and churches respond to the needs of young people in the neighborhood? To what extent is the community association working to help these institutions live up to their promises? Make a list of all the things that you think that your community association should be doing in this area.

2. Do young people in the neighborhood feel that they will find jobs when they graduate? What is the community association

doing to help them?

3. Do banks give mortgages in your neighborhood? Do they give as much mortgage money as they hold in deposits? Do you think they should? What do you think your community association should be doing in this area?

4. If your neighborhood organization conducted a greenlining campaign to force a bank to give mortgages in the neighborhood, would the neighbors support it? How about the institutions? Why or why not?

5. Do you think that urban governments should provide special tax benefits to businesses so that they remain in a city, even if working people end up paying all the taxes? What, if anything, has your neighborhood organization done in this area? What, if anything, do you think it should do?

G. For Further Reading

Talley's Corner. Elliot Liebow,
Waltham, Mass., Little, Brown, 1967.

Urban Disinvestment: New Implications for Community Organization, Research, and Public Policy. Arthur Naperstuck and Gale Cincotta,
Washington, D.C., National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, 1975.

The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York City. Robert Caro,
New York, Vintage, 1975.

The Rape of Our Neighborhoods. William Worthy,
New York, Morrow, 1976.

The Rape of the Taxpayer, Philip Stern,
New York, Vintage, 1974.

UNIT VIII. JUSTICE AND FELLOWSHIP

A. A Founding Principle

Writing about America in the early 19th century, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that, "Feelings and opinions are recruited, the heart is enlarged, and the human mind is developed only by the reciprocal influence of men upon one another. I have shown that these influences are almost null in democratic countries; they must therefore be artificially created, and this can only be accomplished by associations." (1.)

We have focused in these sessions on the problems of developing associations at the neighborhood level, associations that can create "reciprocal influence of men upon one another." We have argued that behind our local problems lie ruptured relationships between people and between people and institutions. We also have tried to demonstrate that battles for our "interests" reflect continuing conflicts over the principle of justice.

Some skeptics, including a few leaders and organizers, might reject this perspective as being overly idealistic. In response, we point out that everything we do and discuss in politics reflects ideals, even if they are the narrowest ideals of security and power. The ideals of interest and power lead to the rule of the self-interested and strong, regardless of justice. We have tried to show that the ideal of justice can lead to balanced communities for all.

Of course, encouraging people to pursue justice always involves an extended process of political education--one that is made all the more difficult by our schools, which neglect justice in order to prepare students for bureaucracies, private and public, where success depnds upon respecting the rules. University social scientists don't talk much about justice either. Indeed, most of them continue to promote the myth that politics is little more than a struggle between individuals and groups for larger slivers of the pie.

Such lessons, learned early in life, frustrate the efforts of organizers to unite communities behind a search for broad ideals. Even when a few neighbors do describe crime, or unemployment, or redlining as injustices, for example, they rarely revere justice itself. Their entire civic training, beyond ritualistic appeals to "liberty and justice for all," has convinced them that a politics based upon the principle of justice is impossible.

Paradoxically, cynicism is all the more reason for an organizer or leader to identify the goal of justice at the very founding of an organization. Some community organizers are afraid to begin this way. They think that because justice is a high principle, they should wait to raise it until neighbors have achieved results on "smaller" matters. This strategy cannot work. As we have seen,

there is no solution to the smallest conflict without reference to the broadest principle of justice. Yet by demonstrating the relevence of the ideal to immediate issues, activists might be able over time to build commitment to the principle itself.

The political philosophers whose theories we have discussed in these sessions--Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Rousseau--also insisted that justice had to be a founding principle of a community. Plato argued that lawgivers and philosophers had to establish both just laws and a just system of political education if justice were to survive. To St. Augustine, the only just basis for a community was the will of God as revealed in Scripture. Indeed, he maintained that the corruption of Rome flowed directly from the corruption of its founding in the slaying of Romulus by Remus. Rousseau believed that the average citizen, "having no taste for any plan than that which suits his particular interest," (2.) required a superhuman Legislator who would write the terms of a just social contract into the Constitution, then disappear. Subsequent rulers, Rousseau believed, would have to be tough-minded in enforcing these first principles.

> We find in history a thousand examples of pusillanimous or ambitious rulers, who were ruined by their slackness or their pride; not one who suffered for having been strictly just. But we ought not to confound negligence with moderation, or clemency with weakness. To be just, it is necessary to be severe; to permit vice, when one has the right and power to suppress it, is to be oneself vicious. (3.)

These arguments should not appear strange to Americans, however. In the course of our history, public leaders have referred back to no fewer than three distinct national foundings, all of them establishing some principle of justice for future generations. Some have invoked the Puritan Founding, the Model of Christian Charity signed aboard the Arabella in 1633:

> The end is to improve our lives to do more service to the Lord, the comfort and increase of the body of Christ whereof we are members, that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world, to serve the Lord and work out our salvation under the power and purity of His holy ordinances. (4.)

Many have repeated these familiar lines from the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal. That they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights--that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. (5.)

Nearly all remind us of the Preamble to the Constitution:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty

upon ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America. (6.)

It is hard to identify an important political speech in our entire history that does not refer to at least one of these passages. This process should remind us that what we say about an organization at the beginning is likely to be what people will say about it for many years.

B. The Importance of Fellowship

Both classical philosophers and their American counterparts equally emphasized the importance of fellowship to sustaining a community's search for justice. As Rousseau advised:

> It is not enough to say to citizens, be good. They must be taught to be so: and even example, which is in this respect the first lesson, is not the sole means to be employed; patriotism is the most efficacious: for, as I have said already, every man is virtuous when his particular will is in all things conformable to the general will, and we voluntarily will what is willed by those whom we love. (7.)

The Puritans sought to put this principle into practice:

> Now the only way...to provide for our posterity is to follow the counsel of Micah: to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God. For this end, we must be knit together in this work as one man. We must entertain each other brotherly affection; we must be willing to abridge ourselves our superfluities, for the supply of others' necessities; we must uphold a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience, and liberality. We must delight in each other, make others' conditions our own, rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together: always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, our community as members of the same body. So shall we keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, the Lord will be our God and delight to dwell among us, as His own people, and will command a blessing upon us in all our ways, so that we shall see much more of His wisdom, power, goodness, and truth than formerly we have been acquainted with. (8.)

From this perspective, fellowship assumes a critical importance in reinforcing the best ideals that a community sets for itself. While most manuals on organizing talk about pressure tactics, mobilization of support, fund-raising, press conferences, and meeting schedules, they ignore this critical dimension. Behind any successful organization lies a group of dedicated friends. The friendship is what enables the workers to sustain defeats and frustrations that invariably occur in long-term efforts for change. Their satisfaction comes not simply in the victories but in the pursuit. They view the process as one of continuing education, mutual reinforcement, and growth. Obviously, when practical ef-

forts fail, even dedicated cadres fall apart. Yet the process of sharing in a sustained campaign for justice can be sufficiently meaningful in itself to hold a group together beyond immediate victories and defeats.

Thus, an organization that believes in justice must find ways to build close friendships around its pursuit. The process cannot be an afterthought. It must become an important part of an organization's structure and plan. Nor are we talking merely about "getting people involved" in the organization, as critical as this process is. We are talking, rather, about getting groups of people involved in the community as friends. While the range of techniques to accomplish this objective is the subject of a course in community organizing, we may examine how three different kinds of organizations approach it--a cooperative, self-help organization; a direct action organization; and a political party. From there, we can make a few points about promoting fellowship around justice in general.

C. Cooperative Self-Help and the Dialogue Process

In Independence, Mo., an organization called "Independence Neighborhood Councils" is attempting an elaborate program of self-development that involves pooling community resources for extensive social, economic, and political cooperation. Earlier in these sessions, we discussed one technique that this group is using to achieve reciprocity among neighbors--namely, the "Neighborhood Courtesy Guidelines." The organization's method for promoting fellowship initially involves generating "Dialogues on What Could Be." It is an interesting example of how neighbors can identify the values that they share. Here is How Joe Falk of Future Associates, Inc., describes it:

HOW DO YOU GET PEOPLE TO COOPERATE

> First you have to have a common pressing problem or a chance to have each person in the group benefit personally in some way. Most people will not cooperate unless their feet are in the fire or they see something that will benefit them almost immediately.
>
> If you have such a situation, then you have to get the people who will benefit most talking and listening to each other about solving the problem or getting the benefits. As their ideas develop and as they get to know one another, they will gradually move toward organizing a cooperative effort if there seems to be no easier way out.
>
> We have developed a very simple, fun to do, method that will save you some time in getting people started discussing situations and possible solutions in a way that leads towards action. We call our process Dialogues on What Could Be...Our dialogue method is a kind of do-it-yourselves educational process that works in several levels of your

awareness potential and provides several different learning experiences at the same time.

First, it enables each participant to gather information about a particular subject...

Second, it orients your thinking to the future...

Third, it lets you practice "evocative" communications, which is an active form of listening, a drawing out of the other person by exposing yourself first...

Fourth, it lets each participant experience being a leader and a follower, since you will take turns directing your dialogue, even though it will be structured to some degree by the evocative questions that we provide...

Fifth, it encourages you and your dialogue mates to look for your differences and similarities, rather than seeking consensus...

Sixth, this entire process is designed to let your experience cooperating in making your dialogue better, so you can get started on your block and your neighborhood once you master the process...

The rules for dialoguing on what could be are listed below...

How to 'Dialogue on What Could Be'

1. Put the evocative questions we have provided or others that you write in sequence on a single page and leave room between questions for note writing.

2. Provide a set of questions for each person who will be attending the session.

3. Arrange a seating for groups of four at card tables, in facing chairs or on the floor.

4. Strive to have at least 12 people (three groups of four) or as many more as possible, since it's better if you change dialogue mates every four questions.

5. Explain that one individual is to start with question #1 and be the "evoker" for that question. That individual is to answer the question first and then draw out the others for the period of time allocated. 5 or 10 minutes per question makes a one or two hour session if you have a series of 12 questions.

6. If anyone starts "lecturing" someone in the group is to wiggle his finger at the person to indicate that they should get back to asking questions, not giving answers. If anyone gets bored, he can cut off the discussion by saying let's move on to the next question. The person on the left of the evoker takes over at that point.

7. Prior to the end of the time limit set for each question, the evoker should try to point out areas of agreement and differences of opinion. You are not trying to arrive at a consensus, just an awareness of where you are in relation to others.

8. Each participant in the group is to play the role of evoker for one question in the time allotted for those four questions, 5 or 10 minutes per question.

9. After each four questions, have the participants switch tables and discuss the next four with different people. This will enable everyone to draw out and be drawn out by nine different people during the dialogue. It will get and keep everyone involved.

10. When the dialogue session is finished, the convener should ask for verbal and written feedback and make any announcements for future sessions. (9.)

This section is from the book Cooperative Community Development, Edited by Joe Falk. Future Associates also publishes six small booklets including "evocative" questions for dialogues on Communicating, Learning, Changing, Living, Planning and Working. These are available from The Future Associates, P.O. Box 912, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66201, for $4.95.

Since we are concerned here with developing fellowship around justice, however, consider the following questions for a "Dialogue on What Could Be" established at the first or second meeting of a group. These questions are similar in form to those suggested by the Future Associates:

1. Name as many injustices as you can that exist in this neighborhood or affect it.

2. Who or what do you think is responsible for each of these injustices?

3. Which of these injustices can we in the neighborhood remedy on our own? Which would require help from people or groups behond the neighborhood?

4. For each injustice that requires help from people beyond the neighborhood, what are all the people or groups whose assistance would be needed to end it?

5. Which three injustices do you think that we should try to remedy first?

6. What are the next steps that we need to take in remedying each of these injustices?

7. Who will take responsibility for implementing each of these steps?

8. When should the next meeting be to report on the progress and

to plan for our next steps? (10.)

If followed systematically, this process should lead the neighbors from a discussion of specific injustices to a plan of action to remedy them: note, however, that we use the word "injustice" rather than "problems," in order to encourage the community to identify common standards of fairness from the very beginning. By engaging neighbors in continuing efforts to fight injustice, the activist eventually can encourage them to develop a common standard of justice itself.

D. The Process of Conflict

The process of remedying injustices should embroil any neighborhood organization in a series of conflicts with government and private institutions. If organized carefully, these struggles should strengthen the commitment of neighbors to one another. Indeed, a second important school of community organization, pioneered by the late Saul Alinsky, is based entirely on the notion that continuing conflict is essential both to building the power of a group and to strengthening the bonds between its members. Here is how Alinsky himself describes the process.

"Conflict Tactics"
from

Reveille for Radicals
by Saul Alinsky (11.)

A People's Organization is a conflict group. This must be openly and fully recognized. Its sole reason for coming into being is to wage war against all evils which cause suffering and unhappiness. A People's Organization is the banding together of large numbers of men and women to fight for those rights which insure a decent way of life. Most of this constant conflict will take place in orderly and conventially approved legal procedures--but in all fights there come times when "the law spoke too softly to be heard in such a noise of war."

The building of a People's Organization is the building of a new power group. The creation of any new power group automatically becomes an intrusion and a threat to the existing power arrangements. It carries with it the menacing implication of displacement and disorganization of the status quo.

Agnes E. Meyer of the Washington Post pointed this out in a study of a People's Organization in Chicago:

These serious-minded inhabitants of Packingtown have never picked a fight, nor have they avoided one when great issues and principles were involved. They have fought because in

a competitive city like Chicago, any new power group has to go through battles if it is going to survive. Their thinking on pressure is very simple.

"We believe that democracy is a government constantly responding to the pressure of its people," a group of council members said to me, "The biggest hope for democracy is that Americans will overcome their lethargy and that more and more people and groups will become articulate and formulate their needs."(1.)

A People's Qrganization is not a philantropic plaything or a social service's ameliorative gesture. It is a deep, hard-driving force, striking and cutting at the very roots of all the evils which beset the people. It recognizes the existence of the vicious circle in which most human beings are caught, and strives viciously to break this circle. It thinks and acts in terms of social surgery and not cosmetic cover-ups. This is one of the reasons why a People's Organization will find that it has to fight its way along every foot of the road toward its destination--a people's world.

Because the character of a People's Organization is such that it will frequently involve itself in conflict, and since most attempts at the building of People's Organizations have been broken by the attacks of an opposition which knows no rules of fair play or so-called ethics, it is imperative that the organizers and leaders of a People's Organization not only understand the necessity for and the nature and purpose of conflict tactics, but become familiar with and skillful in the use of such tactics.

A People's Organization is dedicated to an eternal war. It is a war against poverty, misery, delinquency, disease, injustice, hopelessness, despair, and unhappiness. They are basically the same issues for which nations have gone to war in almost every generation.

A war is not an intellectual debate, and in the war against social evils there are no rules of fair play. In this sense all wars are the same. Rules of fair play are regulations upon which both sides are in mutual agreement. When you have war, it means that neither side can agree on anything. The minimum agreements of decency that either side may display stem not from decency but from fear. Prisoners are treated according to certain minimum standards and both sides hesitate to use certain inhuman weapons simply because of fear of reprisal.

In our war against the social menaces of mankind there can be no compromise. It is life or death. Failing to understand this, many well-meaning liberals look askance and with horror at the nakedness with which a People's Organization will attack or counterattack in its battles. Liberals will settle for a "moral" victory; radicals fight for

1. "Orderly Revolution," Washington Post, June 4, 1945.

victory. These liberals cannot and never will be able to understand the feelings of the rank-and-file people fighting in their own People's Organization any more than one who has never gone through combat action can fully grasp what combat means. The fights for decent housing, economic security, health programs, and for many of those other social issues for which liberals profess their sympathy and support, are to the liberals simply intellectual affinities. They would like to see better housing, health, and economic security, but THEY are not LIVING in the rotten houses; it is not THEIR children who are sick; it is not THEY who are working with the specter of unemployment hanging over their heads; they are not fighting their OWN fight.

It is very well for bystanders to relax in luxurious security and wax critical of the tactics and weapons used by a People's Organization whose people are fighting for their own children, their own homes, their own jobs, and their own lives. It is very well under those circumstances for liberals who have the time time to engage in leisurely democratic discussions to quibble about the semantics of a limited resolution, to look with horror on the split-second decisions, rough-and-ready, up-and-down and sideways swinging and cudgeling of a People's Organization. Unfortunately conditions are not always such that a board of directors can leisurely discuss a problem, refer it to a committee, and carry through with all of Robert's Rules of Order. That luxury is denied to the people who suddenly find themselves subjected to a lightning attack, of what liberals would call a foul character, by the opposition. The people in a People's Organization cannot afford simply to stew in righteous feelings of indignation. They are in a fight for everything that makes life meaningful--and attack by the enemy calls for counterattack.

The People's Organization does not live comfortably and serenely in an ivory tower where it not only can discuss controversial issues but actually possesses the choice of whether or not to take a hand in the controversy. In actual life, conflict, like so many other things that happen to us, does not concern itself too much with our own preferences of the moment any more than it does with our judgement as to whether or not it is time to fight.

A People's Organization lives in a world of hard reality. It lives in the midst of smashing forces, clashing struggles, sweeping cross-currents, ripping passions, conflict, confusion, seeming chaos, the hot and the cold, the squalor and the drama, which people prosaically refer to as life and students describe as "society."

The difference between the conventional liberal protest and the life-and-death type of tactics used by a People's Organization is illustrated by an account of a struggle of one of

the most powerful People's Organizations in the nation. One of the leaders of this organization described the methods used in what he called "the battle of the People versus the Tycoons:"

"The giant of the retail business life of the Across the Tracks neighborhood is Tycoon's Department Store. Its size, volume of business, and capital indelibly stamp it as 'big business.' Tycoon's stands at the corner of Main Street and Washington Road, in the heart of Across the Tracks. Since the turn of the century it has been standing there, a mountain of glittering merchandise in a valley of misery.

"The size of Tycoon's reflected inversely its interest in the local people. It was the biggest and its financial backing the richest and its prices the lowest. Such a commercial combination seemed impregnable, to hell with public relations. As long as Joe Dokes could buy cigarettes 20 per cent cheaper at Tycoon's he would keep coming regardless of what anyone said. Money talks, and here it was hollering cigarettes $1.30 a carton every place, but at Tycoon's $1.05. Black and White Scotch $3.25 any place, $2.25 at Tycoon's. Why worry about public relations? You got 'em. Money talks. Let the little squirts--the two-by-four stores--do the back-patting of the neighborhood priests or the leaders of church or fraternal organizations, or shell out in contributions for dance programs for youth clubs, or for building a recreation hall in a parish. Let those small businessmen pay off Suckers! Well, they weren't any better than the people. But not Tycoon's. They were big enough not to have to worry about what this church or that organization thought. They were so big they couldn't see the small people.

"The Tycoon Store completely ignored the local institutions--they never gave any contributions to any of the churches or any other neighborhood organizations--they never showed any interest in the welfare of the community--and their imperious and domineering manner resulted in at least two of the churches asking their parishioners to boycott Tycoon's. Tycoon's met these boycotts with their sure-fire formula--by advertising drastically reduced prices for certain nationally advertised items. Most of the people ignored the advice of their ministers and priests, and business boomed at Tycoon's. There has also been constant complaining and criticism regarding the wages paid by Tycoon's and also the conditions under which employees worked. Although Tycoon's cut-priced each local church boycott into failure, they also cut deeper and deeper into the pride and respect of the ministers and priests. Bitterness and animosity began to mount.

"The Tycoon public-relations policy at Christmas probably caused more bitterness than any other single act. For years it had been traditional for Across the Tracks to raise a general Christmas fund in order to provide Christmas baskets for the needy families of the neighborhood. Toward this collection the schoolchildren contributed pennies. But each Christmas, this Gulliver-like tremendous department store, which far overshadowed all of the other Lilliputian business houses in the neighborhood, would contribute $3.50 worth of hard candy to the entire fund! According to whispers in the community, the wholesale price of the candy to Tycoon's was approximately forty cents. This action on the part of the Tycoon store infuriated the people of the neighborhood and within two years a slogan sprang up in the community: 'Christmas is coming. Maybe big-hearted Tycoon's will contribute fifty cent's worth of candy instead of forty cents.'

"The icy indifference of Tycoon's made the people boil. Like a snowball getting even bigger as it rolls downhill so did public anger mount higher and higher. Each passing day aggravated the situation. Each passing week found more and more people articulating what had now become a hatred as cold as the icy indifference of Tycoon's.

"The Tycoon situation had become a tinderbox and the slightest spark would set off a public conflagration. It was also apparent that the Christmas season would be the one time of the year when even the tiniest spark would start the fire.

"In mid-November,1941, the spark came. Some 250 of the local neighborhood boys who were working at Tycoon's joined a labor union and went on strike. These boys, whom we knew as human beings--many of them we knew by their first names--some of them had been married in our churches--some of the baptized--almost all of them members in the various athletic organizations in our community--these boys were our boys!

"Public feeling against Tycoon's steadily climbed to the explosive point. People in the streets were talking. The slogan of the striking union, "Life begins at $14 a week at Tycoon's," began to crystallize all of the latent hatred, prejudices, and antagonism of the local residents against Tycoon's.

"Through the People's Organization the people began to act. A soup kitchen was set up for the strikers. Ministers and priests crusaded their cause from the altars, and organization leaders spoke before their members. An organized people were moving. Plans were drawn up for an all-community strike against Tycoon's. By the last of November it seemed certain that the United States would be confronted with the first 'all-community,' 'all-consumer' strike in its history. An aroused people in Across the Tracks had reached the decision that there should be a complete boycott of Tycoon's Department Store. A community strike with an all-community picket line: ministers, priests, labor leaders, heads of fraternal, social, nationality, religious, business and patriotic societies side by side--120,000 people versus $10,000,000. A

battle that could have only one outcome--victory for the people.

"Faced with a battle of these dimensions the People's Organization appointed a War Cabinet to lead them through the Tycoon war. I was elected chairman.

"At the outset I attempted in every possible way to delay any community action. I did this because on the surface there was a jurisdiction dispute involved here in which another union (which, judging from all their actions, had a good solid streak of racketeering in them) had been brought into the picture by Tycoon's and Tycoon's was attempting to hide under the guise of a jurisdictional dispute. They were holding up their hands and saying 'We're for labor. We just don't know whom to deal with. This isn't a fight with Tycoon's. This is a fight between two unions.'

"If, in spite of all we could do, the situation became such that the People's Organization would be engaged in an action such as a community strike, then it was imperative that such action take place on issues that would be impeccably clean. As it was, we recognized the danger of being maneuvered by Tycoon's into a position where instead of the fight being between Tycoon's and the People's Organization, it would be a conflict between the People's Organization and one of the contending unions.

"Among the many other reasons which, to my thinking, argued for delay was this: In order to make an all-community strike effective against Tycoon's, it would mean not only the removal of all restraints but actually further inciting an already enraged people. While there was no doubt that this could be done and done within twenty-four hours, we had grave concern as to whether a community, once so completely aroused, could be held under control and not engage in acts of violence which would result in discredit to the People's Organization.

"For example, from Tycoon's operations (as will be described later on) certain threats were made against two of our priests and one of our ministers. Once these would get out, John would tell Pete that Father Smtih had been threatened. Pete would tell Jack that Father Smith had been slugged. Jack would tell Ted that Father Smith was in the hospital with a skull fracture. Ted would tell Jim that Father Smith was dying and Jim might very well physically assault the Tycoon officials. That's the way stories go and there's nothing you can do about it.

"With all this in mind, we began to stall. Fundamental to our stalling was the general idea that time serves to allay human anger and that delay would lessen the possibilities of the contemplated forceful direct action by the community.

"With the tremendous fire, zeal and passion on the part of the People's Organization flaming up into dangerous proportions, there seemed to be only one way in which to control it and lead it safely through a logical strategic campaign that would bring victory, and that was to appear to be even more bitter and even more vindictive than the others, then say, 'Follow me,' and take them around the corner into calm waters.

Once again, this is something we commonly do in our everyday life. The common effective approach in trying to defend some person against whom your companion is very bitter is not to say, 'You're wrong; he's really a good guy!" The only result of that kind of approach is an argument, the building of a barrier of hostility, of bitterness between your companion and yourself. The intelligent approach is to pick up the cudgels with your companion and beat them in unison as follows: 'There's no question but that you're right. Smith is a louse. I hate him even more than you do. But you'll agree with me that on this one little point Smith has something on his side, and of course you'll agree with me that he has this too.' And you just keep going until Smith isn't such a bad guy after all.

"However, we were in a real dilemma. First, we had to win the fight. Second, we had to win in such a way that there would be no violence and yet the battle would be sufficiently dramatic to serve as an outlet for the stirred-up passions of our people. In other words, we wanted a bloodless victory.

"We decided to weave the campaign strategy about the one big weakness of Tycoon's: their superior high-and-mighty way of dealing with people--and also, since Tycoon's would fight by no rules, we wouldn't either.

"The People's Organization held a meeting on December 15 and demanded action from the War Cabinet. When we announced that the time had come for action, there was great relief on the faces of those present. I could not help but realize what a strain it must have been to them to go along with our previous policy of stalling. They all began to talk at once. 'Oh boy--now let's get them.' 'Can't understand why you waited this long.' 'Let's go--let's go--come on!"

"We discussed for some time how to set off the opening gun for the war and finally agreed that we would act as a people's court and give Tycoon's a chance to present their side of the case. Then there could be no charge that we fought them without even giving them a hearing. With this agreed we tried to speak to the president of the Tycoon Company, but his secretary coolly informed us that he was in conference. The haughty Tycoons were running true to form. 'If they can only keep it up,' we thought to ourselves, 'we'll win.' After failing to contact them by telephone it was agreed to telegraph them with the understanding with Western Union that the telegram would be delivered personally to the president of the Tycoon Company. The following wire was sent:

PRESIDENT
TYCOON'S INCORPORATED
MAIN AND WASHINGTON ROAD

FOLLOWING MESSAGE LEFT THIS AFTERNOON WITH SECRETARY TO PRESIDENT OF TYCOON'S: WE ARE CALLING YOU ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE'S ORGANIZATION REPRESENTING ALL OF THE CHURCHES, SOCIAL, FRATERNAL, BUSINESS, AND NATIONALITY ORGANIZATION IN ACROSS THE TRACKS. WE HAVE BEEN REQUESTED BY OUR PEOPLE TO INQUIRE INTO THE MERITS OF THE CASE OF THE PRESENT STRIKE GOING ON AT YOUR STORE. YOU OR AN ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION IS REQUESTED TO BE PRESENT AT TWO PM TOMORROW AT THE COMMUNITY HALL OF THE ACROSS THE TRACKS ORGANIZATION. IT HAS BEEN AND ALWAYS WILL BE THE POLICY OF THE ACROSS THE TRACKS ORGANIZATION TO GIVE A FAIR HEARING TO BOTH SIDES BEFORE TAKING ACTION.

WAR CABINET, PEOPLE'S COURT
ACROSS THE TRACKS ORGANIZATION

"This telegram to Tycoon's president requested him to appear, before a people's court, to defend his company's case against the strikers. We informed them that after the hearing the Across the Tracks Organization would reach a decision and act upon it. Tycoon's indignantly refused to accept the invitation, hysterically charging: 'People's Courts--they have those in Russia! This is the United States of America--we believe in the American law, not in People's Courts.

"With the absence of Tycoon's president from the hearing, the War Cabinet of the Across the Tracks Organization listened to the case of the union and found in their favor. They then issued a terse statement to Tycoon's asking them if they saw any reason, in view of their verdict, why the Across the Tracks Organization should not take steps to enforce their decision.

"Within an hour Tycoon's attorney was on the phone. He insisted on our coming down to his office. I was prepared to refuse him, but upon glancing out the window I noticed a driving snowstorm--what a perfect opportunity for a demonstration of the arrogance of Tycoon's in asking that five priests, three ministers, four businessmen, and three labor leaders trudge through the cold wintery snows to meet with a lone Tycoon lawyer! Also, his being a Tycoon lawyer would provide a perfect setting out of which to come in from the cold--we, the humble poor from Across the Tracks coming into an office suite furnished at the cost of thousands of dollars. I accepted the invitation. The plan worked beyond my wildest dreams. We came in out of the snow to the luxurious offices of Van Snoot, Van Snoot, Van Snoot, and Snoot. Snoot made the horrible mistake of trying to impress us with all his opulence and power. Because there was an insufficient number of chairs in the conference room, he suggested to one of the priests that he pick up one of the chairs out in the hall and carry it in. That was the crowning blow. It was not the specific act itself but just that it fit into the general picture of the disdain and contempt of Tycoon's and their representatives for the common people.

"During the meeting Mr. Snoot admitted that the majority of the store employees were enrolled in the membership of the striking union but he attempted to portray the dispute as one between the striking union and another union widely suspected of racketeering, with Tycoon's being the innocent victim. Throughout, Mr. Snoot's manner toward us was one of condescension. Our position was simply this: We were not interested in the alleged jurisdictional fight per se. We believe in the law of the land according recognition to the rights of workers to choose their own unions and bargain collectively. If the majority of the employees preferred the striking union, that settled that; and from what Snoot had said it appeared that Tycoon's sided with the racket union and was deliberately fighting the striking union. We charged collusion between Tycoon's and an alledged competing union which by their own admission was nonexistent. Snoot arose in a rage and bellowed: 'Are you people casting insinuations against the integrity of our clients, the Tycoons?' We all laughed. Someone said: 'We're not insinuating, we're saying so.' Snoot sat down, and a grim look came over his face. 'I'd like to have your names and organizations,' he said as he picked up a pencil. 'What for?' we inquired. 'For the record,' he replied. I pressed him: 'What record?' He flushed. 'The record--you know, the record!' 'I don't know,' I answered. Snoot looked very stern. 'Are you afraid of giving me your names?'

"I thought to myself, 'Well, why not? This is a fight for keeps, and as far as what Tycoon's will do with the names--it will probably be some action that will rebound to our advantage--for, judging from their acumen to date, Tycoon's can do no right. We gave him our names and then walked out into the snowstorm.

"The next morning it began. Groups of armed thugs professing to represent the competing union descended upon our neighborhood and threatened those of us who had given our names to Snoot with bodily injury and worse if we did not withdraw from the case. In their dark threats of violence they included the names of ministers and priests. Statements such as these were made to individual members of the Across the Tracks Organization: 'If you want to stay healthy, stop fooling with Tycoon's,' or 'If you want to keep on breathing, get your ass out of this fight--and we mean business.' To our questions as to where they got our names they replied, 'You know damn well where we got them.'

'We called Snoot and he admitted turning over our names to this union. We told him what had happened and he calmly replied that he wasn't responsible for their actions. We said, 'YOU THINK SO--listen, fellow, if you start an automobile, put it in gear and then jump out, you're responsible for what happens. You turned our names in to a bunch of killers and whatever may happen is your responsibility from now on.'

"'Wait a minute--wait a minute--' he broke in. There was stark panic in his voice. We hung up.

"That night we decided the time had come to attack. This was it.

The Tycoon blunders had rendered them so vulnerable that a certain line of strategy might well win the war with none of the disastrous effects that we had feared.

"Here was the psychological moment to attack, both to win the war without a war, and yet to provide a satisfactory outlet for the high-running passions and aggressions of our people. With this as our purpose we drew up the following plan of strategy. First we would prepare an attack of such devastating proportions and so utterly diabolic in character that in some respects it would even shock the morals of such people as the Tycoon officials. With the stage thus set, parts of the curtain would be carefully raised in front of Tycoon's stoolpigeons so that the full picture would be conveyed back to the Tycoons, with the underlying understanding that this was just what we were going to do in the preliminary skirmish--God help you once you taste what we will actually do in battle. Our objective was very clear. If we could pulverize the Tycoons with fear and force their capitulation, the victory would be won. In that case the terrible cost of a long struggle would be averted.

"We then began to set up the nightmare props on our stage. First, operating upon the golden rule of 'Do unto the Tycoons as they would do unto you,' we set up the machinery to bait the Tycoons as subscribers to a totalitarian ideology as expressed by their low wages, use of mobsters and gunmen, and general unAmericanism in refusing to acknowledged the rights of organized labor. Following the threats against our officers, among them ministers and priests, which we made on a Saturday, we prepared to go to court on Tuesday and request an injunction restraining Tycoon's, Incorporated, from murdering Protestant ministers and Catholic priests. While we probably would not have been granted an injunction, nevertheless the publicity attendant on our action would have blow the Tycoon empire clear out of business. Tycoon's had presented us with our trump card. This and other Tycoon blunders were turned about to form a huge Frankenstein monster.

"The stage was set on Sunday. A Tycoon stoolpigeon was given a peek under the curtain with the announcement of Tuesday as D-Day and ten A.M. as H-Hour. The chips were down and if now Tycoon's did not capitulate it would be a long and bloody war. Monday night the president of Tycoon's, Incorporated, surrendered unconditionally.

"Although this has nothing to do with the fight, what happened after the Tycoons gave up certainly proved our point about all kinds of people being able to work together in a People's Organization once they got to know each other.

"Tycoon's joined the People's Organization and today they are not only among the most popular, respected, and loved members of the community, but one of the chief officials of Tycoon's has been elected and re-elected to one of the most important posts in the People's Organization."

The foundation of a People's Organization is the community, and the foundation of conflict tactics is community traditions. Just as knowledge of the terrain is of the utmost importance for military tactics in actual warfare, so too is the knowledge, the full understanding and appreciation of the power of local traditions. The first maxim in conflict tactics to all leaders of People's Organizations is that THE TRADITION IS THE TERRAIN.

We have seen in every actual conflict tactic how organizers and People's Organization leaders have utilized the place or role of traditions and values in the community in maneuvering the opposition into a vulnerable position. The traditions of a community are so strong that a resourceful People's Organization leader can utilize these traditions to defeat opposition which is far stronger and far bigger than the actual People's Organization. In many cases the stronger the opposition is, the deeper and more seriously will it impale itself upon the spearheads of community traditions.

The description of the conflict of the People versus Tycoon's brings this out clearly. The exploiting by the organizer of the demand by Tycoon's attorney that five priests, three ministers, four businessmen, and three labor leaders go downtown to meet him, instead of his going down to the community, fitted in perfectly with the community tradition of resentment against Big Business.

A historical illustration of the role of tradition in conflict was found during the critical days of the French Revolution. The Revolution itself was almost lost because of the inertia and fear of the general populace. Thomas Paine's Rights of Man vividly described what the violation of tradition meant to the French Revolution:

The foreign troops began to advance towards the city. The Prince de Lambesc, who commanded a body of German calvary, approached by the Place of Louis XV, which connects itself with some of the streets. In his march. he insulted and struck an old man with his sword. The French are remarkable for their respect to old age, and *the insolence with which it appeared to be done, uniting with the general fermentation they were in, produced a powerful effect, and a cry.* To arms! To arms! *spread itself in a moment over the city.*

The enormous importance of tradition in shaping the life of man is a common and accepted fact. What is not too well recognized is that violation of tradition has from time to time unleashed powers which have drastically altered the course of mankind.

Thus, through working together on direct action campaigns, organization members develop strong attachments to one another. It is a process that anyone who has served in the army understands, and one which anyone who has heard veterans talking about their combat experiences can appreciate as well. It is no accident that Alinsky uses military metaphors to describe how a People's Organization operates.

Yet we must offer a word of caution here. Alinsky is talking about organizations that develop as coalitions between established groups within a community--churches, unions, social agencies, civic associations. These groups already have developed techniques to hold their own members together, techniques that may never involve conflict. Conflict may heighten commitment, but it is tiring as well. Without a process to stregthen loyalty in the absence of war, a group can lose its following from sheer exhaustion. Moreover, if an organization without any of the cohesion that characterizes churches, unions, or social clubs comes together exclusively around conflict, it can bring out hostility and hate in its members without ever providing experiences in planning positive programs that justice also requires. As Professor Wilson C. McWilliams observes, "A community of battle can't outlast the battle and never does. Those who get tied up to a community of battle, in fact, become perrennially violent persons. They can't live without it." (12.) We may recall that while God permits Moses to lead the Jews to the Promised Land, He leaves the creation of the community of Israel to others. The emotions of war are not necessarily the ingrediants of just rule.

E. The Political Connection: Tradition, Symbols and Fellowship

The limitations of conflict should force activists and organizers to reinforce common commitment to justice among neighbors even in the absence of specific campaigns. The inclusion of justice in the constitution as a founding principle is part of this process, as is an effort to involve members in continuing dialogues on what justice requires. As the group matures, moreover, its program should both broaden and intensify. What begins as a series of campaigns to remedy specific injustices should emerge as a continuing neighborhood dialogue on the vision of justice itself.

If this process sounds utopian, we should realize that at least one important political institution is based partially upon it--the political party. Indeed, Alexis de Tocqueville argued that it is often the political party that strengthens civic involvement, not the other way around:

> Certain men happen to have a common interest in some concern; either a commercial undertaking is to be managed, or some speculation in manufactures is to be tried: they meet, they combine, and thus, by degrees they become familiar with the principle of association. The greater the multiplicity of small affairs, the more do men, even without knowing it, acquire facility in prosecuting great undertakings in common.
>
> Civil associations, therefore, facilitate polical associations; but, on the other hand, political association singularly strengthens and

> improves associations for civil purposes. In civil life, every man may, strictly speaking, fancy that he can provide for his own wants; in politics, he can fancy no such thing. When a people, then, have any knowledge of public life, the notion of associations and the wish to coalesce present themselves every day to the minds of the whole community; whatever natural repugnance may restrain men from acting in concert, they will always be ready to combine for the sake of the party. Thus political life makes the love and practice of association more general; it imparts a desire of union and teaches the means of combination to numbers of men who otherwise have always lived apart.
>
> Politics give birth not only to numerous associations, but to associations of great extent. In civil life it seldom happens that any one interest draws a great number of men to act in concert; much skill is required to bring such an interest into existence; but in politics opportunities present themselves every day. Now, it is solely in great associations that the general value of the principle of association is displayed. Citizens who are individually powerless do not very clearly anticipate the strength that they may acquire by uniting together; it must be shown to them in order to be understood. Hence it is often easier to collect a multitude for a public purpose that a few persons; a thousand citizens do not see what interest they have in combining together; ten thousand will be perfectly aware of it. In politics men combine for great undertakings, and the use they make of the principle of association in important affairs practically teaches them that it is their interest to help one another in those of less moment. A political association draws a number of individuals at the same time out of their own circle; however they may be naturally kept asunder by age, mind, and fortune, it places them nearer together and brings them into contact. Once met, they can always meet again. (13.)

As de Tocqueville argues, the sheer magnitude of a political party allows its members to contemplate the broader issue of justice. No one neighborhood group can promise to create jobs, build houses, and provide decent health care for everyone. No major political party will fail to do so. When citizens confront a bureaucracy from their local neighborhood group, they have only the strength of disruption and argument. When party activists confront a legislator with the same demand, they can threaten to withhold political support and assistance as well.

It is not only power that preserves political parties; they survive through the cultivation of political memory among their supporters. Democratic leaders ask their followings to recall the noble deeds of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Lyndon Johnson. Republicans invoke the memories of Abraham Lincoln, Herbert Hoover, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Democrats talk about being the "party of the people"; Republicans boast of their traditions of "freedom." In short, parties instill loyalty to their best ideals through tradition and symbols. We may cite no greater expert on this process than George Washington Plunkitt, a Democratic Ward leader in New York's Tammany Hall around the turn of the 20th Century:

Tammany's Patriotism
by. G.W. Plunkitt (14.)

Tammany's the most patriotic organization on earth...Nobody pays any attention to the Fourth of July any longer except Tammany and the small boy---The very constitution of the Tammany society requires that we must assemble at the wigwam on the Fourth, regardless of the weather, and listen to the readin' of the Declaration of Independence and patriotic speeches.

You ought to attend one of these meetin's. They're a liberal education in patriotism. The great hall upstairs is filled with five thousand people, suffocatin' from heat and smoke. Every man Jack of these five thousand knows that down in the basement there's a hundred cases of champagne and two hundred kegs of beer ready to flow when the signal is given. Yet that crowd sticks to their seats without turnin' a hair while, for four solid hours, the Declaration of Independence is read, long-winded orators speak, and the glee club sings itself hoarse.

Talk about heroism in the battlefield! That comes and passes away in a moment. You ain't got time to be anything but heroic. But just think of five thousand sittin' in the hottest place on earth for four long hours, with parched lips and gnawin' stomachs, and knowin' all the time that the delights of the oasis in the desert were only two flights downstairs! Ah, that is the highest kind of patriotism, the patriotism of the long sufferin' and endurance. What man wouldn't rather face a cannon for a minute or two than thirst for four hours, with champagne and beer almost under his nose?

And then see how they applaud and yell when patriotic things are said! As soon as the man on the platform starts off with, "when, in the course of human events," word goes around that it's the Declaration of Independence, and a mighty roar goes up. The Declaration ain't a very short document and the crowd has heard it on every Fourth but they give it just as fine a send-off as if it was brand-new and excitin'. Then the "long talkers" get in their work, that is two or three orators who are good for an hour each. Heat never has any effect on these men. They use every minute of their time. Sometimes human nature gets the better of a man in the audience and he begins to nod, but he always wakes up with a hurrah for the Declaration of Independence. (14.)

Yet it is not merely appeals to common traditions that strengthen parties. Ultimately, they gain support by maintaining personal contacts at the neighborhood level. Plunkitt's most important advice has to do with this process.

Plunkitt of Tammany Hall (excerpts)
by William Riordin (15.)

There's only one way to hold a district: you must study human nature and act accordin'. You can't study human nature in books. Books is a hindrance more than anything else. If you have been to college, so much the worse for you. You'll have to unlearn all you learned be-

fore you can get right down to human nature, and unlearnin' takes a lot of time. Some men can never forget what they learned at college. Such men may get to be district leaders by a fluke, but they never last.

To learn real human nature you have to among the people, see them and be seen. I know every man, woman, and child in the Fifteenth District, except them that's been born this summer--and I know some of them, too. I know what they like and what they don't like, what they are strong at and what they are weak in, and I reach them by approachin' at the right side.

For instance, here's how I gather in the young men. I hear of a young feller that's proud of his voice, thinks he can sing fine. I ask him to come around to Washington Hall and join our Glee Club. He comes and sings and he's a follower of Plunkitt for life. Another young feller gains a reputation as a baseball player in a vacant lot. I bring him into our baseball club. That fixes him. You'll find him workin' for my ticket at the polls next election day. Then there's the feller that likes rowin' on the river, the young feller that makes a name as a waltzer on his block, the young feller than's handy with his dukes--I rope them all in by givin' them opportunities to show themselves off. I don't trouble them with political arguments. I just study human nature and act accordin'.

But you may say this game won't work with the high-toned fellers, the fellers that go through college and then join the Citizens' Union. Of course it wouldn't work. I have a special treatment for them. I ain't like the patent medicine man that gives the same medicine for all diseases. The Citizens' Union kind of a young man! I love him! He's the daintiest morsel of the lot, and he don't often escape me.

Before telling you how I catch him, let me mention that before the election last year, the Citizens' Union said they had four hundred or five hundred enrolled voters in my district. They had a lovely headquarters, too, beautiful roll-top desks and the cutest rugs in the world. If I was accused of havin' contributed to fix up the nest for them, I wouldn't deny it under oath. What do I mean by that? Never mind. You can guess from the sequel, if you're sharp.

Well, election day came. The Citizens' Union's candidate for Senator, who ran against me, just polled five votes in the district, while I polled something more than 14,000 votes. What became of the 400 or 500 Citizens' Union enrolled voters in my district? Some people guessed that many of them were good Plunkitt men all along and worked with the Cits just to bring them into the Plunkitt camp by election day. You can guess that way, too, if you want to. I never contradict stories about me, especially in hot weather. I just call your attention to the fact that on the last election day 395 Citizens' Union enrolled voters in my district were missin' and unaccounted for.

I tell you frankly, though, how I have captured some of the Citizens' Union's young men. I have a plan that never fails. I watch the City Record to see when there's civil service examinations for good things. Then I take my young Cit in hand, tell him all about the good thing and get him worked up till he goes and takes an examination. I don't bother about him any more. It's a cinch he that he comes back to me in a few days and asks to join Tammany Hall. Come over to Washington Hall some night and I'll show you a list of names on our rolls marked "C.S." which means, "bucked up against civil service."

As to the older voters, I reach them, too. No, I don't send them campaign literature. That's rot. People can get all the political stuff they want to read--and a good deal more, too--in the papers. Who reads speeches, nowadays, anyhow? It's bad enough to listen to them. You ain't goin' to gain any votes by stuffin' the letter boxes with campaign documents. Like as not you'll lose votes, for there's nothin' a man hates more than to hear the letter carrier ring his bell and go to the letter box expectin' to find a letter he was lookin' for, and find only a lot of printed politics. I met a man this very mornin' who told me he voted the Democratic State ticket last year because the Republicans kept crammin' his letter box with campaign documents.

What tells in holdin' your grip on your district is to go right down among the poor families and help them in the different ways they need help. I've got a regular system for this. If there's a fire in Ninth, Tenth, or Eleventh Avenue, for example, any hour of the day or night, I'm usually there with some of my election district captains as soon as the fire engines. If a family is burned out I don't ask whether they are Republicans or Democrats and I don't refer them to the Charity Organization Society, which would investigate their case in a month or two and decide they were worthy of help about the time they are dead from starvation. I just get quarters for them, buy clothes for them if their clothes were burned up, and fix them up till they get things runnin' again. It's philantropy, but it's politics, too-mighty good politics. Who can tell how many votes one of these fires bring me? The poor are the most grateful people in the world, and let me tell you, they have more friends in their neighborhoods than the rich have in theirs.

If there's a family in my district in want I know it before the charitable societies do, and me and my men are first on the ground. I have a special corps to look up such cases. The consequence is that the poor look up to George W. Plunkitt as a father, come to him in trouble--and don't forget him on election day.

Another thing, I can always get a job for a deservin' man. I make it a point to keep on the track of jobs, and it seldom happens that I don't have a few up my sleeve ready for use. I know every big employer in the district and in the whole city, for that matter, and they ain't in the habit of sayin' no to me when I ask them for a job.

And the children--the little roses of the district! Do I forget

them? Oh no! They know me, every one of them, and they know that a sight of Uncle George and candy means the same thing. Some of them are the best kind of vote-getters. I'll tell you a case. Last year a little Eleventh Avenue rosebud, whose father is a Republican, caught hold of his whiskers on election day and said she wouldn't let go till he'd promise to vote for me. And she didn't.

Note: THIS CHAPTER (STRENUOUS LIFE OF THE TAMMANY DISTRICT LEADER) IS BASED ON EXTRACTS FROM PLUNKITT'S DIARY AND ON MY DAILY OBSERVATION OF THE WORK OF THE DISTRICT LEADER - W.L.R.

The life of the Tammany district leader is strenuous. To his work is due the wonderful recuperative power of the organization.

One year it goes down in defeat and the prediction is made that it will never again raise its head. The district leader, undaunted by defeat, collects his scattered forces, organizes them as only Tammany knows how to organize, and in a little while the organization is as strong as ever.

No other politician in New York or elsewhere is exactly like the Tammany district leader or works as he does. As a rule, he has no business or occupation other than politics. He plays politics every day and night in the year, and his headquarters bears the inscription, "Never closed."

Everybody in the district knows him. Everybody knows where to find him, and nearly everybody goes to him for assistance of one sort or another, especially the poor of the tenements.

He is always obliging. He will go to the police courts to put in a good word for the "drunks and disorderlies" or pay their fines, if a good word is not effective. He will attend christenings, weddings, funerals. He will feed the hungry and help bury the dead.

A philanthropist? Not at all. He is playing politics all the time.

Brought up in Tammany Hall, he has learned how to reach the hearts of the great mass of voters. He does not bother about reaching their heads. It is his belief that arguments and campaign literature have never gained votes.

He seeks direct contact with the people, does them good turns when he can, and relies on their not forgetting him on election day. His heart is always in his work, too, for his subsistence depends on its results.

If he holds his district and Tammany is in power, he is simply rewarded by a good office and the opportunities that go with it. What these opportunities are has been shown by the quick rise to wealth of so many Tammany district leaders. With the examples before him of Richard Croker, once leader of the Twentieth District; John F. Carroll, formerly leader of the Twenty-ninth; Timothy ("Dry Dollar") Sullivan, late leader

of the Sixth, and many others, he can always look forward to riches and ease while he is going through the drudgery of his daily routine.

This is a record of a day's work by Plunkitt:

2 a.m.: Aroused from sleep by the ringing of his doorbell; went to the door and found a bartender, who asked him to go to the police station and bail out a saloon-keeper who had been arrested for violating the excise law. Furnished bail and returned to bed at three o'clock.

6 a.m.: Awakened by fire engines passing his house. Hastened to the scene of the fire, according to the custom of the Tammany district leaders, to give assistance to the fire sufferers, if needed. Met several of his election district captains who are always under orders to look out for fires, which are considered great vote-getters. Found several tenants who had been burned out, took them to a hotel, supplied them with clothes, fed them, and arranged temporary quarters for them until they could rent and furnish new apartments.

8:30 a.m.: Went to the police court to look after his constituents. Found six "drunks." Secured the discharge of four by a timely word with the judge, and paid the fines of two.

9 a.m.: Appeared in the Municipal District Court. Directed one of his district captains to act as counsel for a widow against whom dispossess proceedings had been instituted and obtained an extension of time. Paid the rent of a poor family about to be dispossessed and gave them a dollar for food.

11 a.m.: At home again. Found four men waiting for him. One had been discharged by the Metropolitan Railway Company for neglect of duty, and wanted the district leader to fix things. Another wanted a job on the road. The third sought a place on the Subway and the fourth, a plumber, was looking for work with the Consolidated Gas Company. The district leader spent nearly three hours fixing things for the four men, and succeeded in each case.

3 p.m.: Attended the funeral of an Italian as far as the ferry. Hurried back to make his appearance at the funeral of a Hebrew constituent. Went conspicuously to the front both in the Catholic church and the synagogue, and later attended Hebrew confirmation ceremonies in the synagogue.

7 p.m.: Went to district headquarters and presided over a meeting of election district captains. Each captain submitted a list of all the voters in his district, reported on their attitude toward Tammany, suggested who might be won over and how they could be won, told who were in need, and who were in trouble of any kind and the best way to reach them. District leader took notes and gave orders.

8 p.m.: Went to a church fair. Took chances on everything, bought ice cream for the young girls and the children. Kissed the little ones, flattered their mothers and took their fathers out for something down at the corner.

9 p.m.: At the clubhouse again. Spent $10 on tickets for a church excursion and promised a subscription for a new church bell. Bought tickets for a baseball game to be played by two nines from his district. Listened to the complaints of a dozen pushcart peddlers who said they were persecuted by the police and assured them he would go to Police Headquarters in the morning and see about it.

10:30 p.m.: Attended a Hebrew wedding reception and dance. Had previously sent a handsome wedding present to the bride.

12 p.m.: In bed.

That is the actual record of one day in the life of Plunkitt. He does some of the same things every day, but his life is not so monotonous as to be wearisome.

Sometimes the work of a district leader is exciting, especially if he happens to have a rival who intends to make a contest for the leadership at the primaries. In that case, he is even more alert, tries to reach the fires before his rival, sends out runners to look for "drunks and disorderlies" at the police stations, and keeps a very close watch on the obituary columns of the new papers.

A few years ago there was a bitter contest for the Tammany leadership of the Ninth District between John C. Sheehan and Frank J. Goodwin. Both had had long experience in Tammany politics and both understood every move of the game.

Every morning their agents went to their respective headquarters before seven o'clock and read through the death notices in all the morning papers. If they found that anybody in the district had died, they rushed to the homes of their principals with the information and then there was a race to the house of the deceased to offer condolences, and, if the family were poor, something more substantial.

On the day of the funeral there was another contest. Each faction tried to surpass the other in the number and appearance of the carraiges it sent to the funeral, and more than once they almost came to blows at the church or in the cemetary.

On one occasion Goodwinites played a trick on their adversaries which has since been imitated in other districts. A well-known liquor dealer who had a considerable following died, and both Sheehan and Goodwin were eager to become his political heir by making a big showing at the funeral.

Goodwin managed to catch the enemy napping. He went to all the livery stables in the district, hired all the carriages for the day, and gave orders to two hundred of his men to be on hand as mourners.

Sheehan had never had any trouble about getting all the carriages that he wanted, so he let the matter go until the night before the funeral. Then he found that he could not hire a carriage in the district.

He called his district committee together in a hurry and explained the situation to them. He could get all the vehicles he needed in the adjoining district, he said, but if he did that, Goodwin would rouse the voters of the Ninth by declaring that he (Sheehan) had patronized foreign industries.

Finally, it was decided that there was nothing to do but to go over to Sixth Avenue and Broadway for carriages. Sheehan made a fine turnout at the funeral, but the deceased was hardly in his grave befor Goodwin raised the cry of "Protection to home industries," and denounced his rival for patronizing livery-stable keepers outside of his district. The cry had its effect on the primary campaign. At all events, Goodwin was elected leader.

A recent contest for the leadership of the Second District illustrated further the strenuous work of the Tammany district leaders. The contestants were Patrick Divver, who had managed the district for years, and Thomas F. Foley.

Both were particularly anxious to secure the large Italian vote. They not only attended all the Italian christenings and funerals, but also kept a close lookout for the marriages in order to be on hand with wedding presents.

At first, each had his own reporter in the Italian quarter to keep track of the marriages. Later, Foley conceived a better plan. He hired a man to stay all day at the City Hall marriage bureau, where most Italian couples go through the civil ceremony, and telephone to him at his saloon when anything was doing at the bureau.

Foley had a number of presents ready for use and, whenever he received a telephone message from his man, he hastened to the City Hall with a ring or a watch or a piece of silver and handed it to the bride with his congratulations. As a consequence, when Divver got the news and went to the home of the couple with his present, he always found that Foley had been ahead of him. Toward the end of the campaign, Divver also stationed a man at the marriage bureau and then there were daily foot races and fights between the two heelers.

Sometimes the rivals came into conflict at the deathbed. One night a poor Italian peddler died in Roosevelt Street. The news reached Divver and Foley about the same time, and as they knew the family of the man was destitute, each went to an undertaker and brought him to the Roosevelt Street tenement.

The rivals and the undertakers met at the house and an altercation ensued. After much discussion the Divver undertaker was selected. Foley had more carriages at the funeral, however, and he further impressed the Italian voters by paying the widow's rent for a month, and sending her half a ton of coal and a barrel of flour.

The rivals were put on their mettle toward the end of the campaign by the wedding of a daughter of one of the original Cohens of the Baxter Street region. The Hebrew vote in the district is nearly as large as the Italian vote, and Divver and Foley set out to capture the Cohens and their friends.

They stayed up nights thinking what they would give the bride. Neither knew how much the other was prepared to spend on a wedding present, or what form it would take; so spies were employed by both sides to keep watch on the jewelry stores, and the jewelers of the district were bribed by each side to impart the desired information.

At last Foley heard that Divver had purchased a set of silver knives, forkes and spoons. He at once bought a duplicate set and added a silver tea service. When the presents were displayed at the home of the bride, Divver was not in a pleasant mood and he charged his jeweler with treachery. It may be added that Foley won at the primaries.

One of the fixed duties of a Tammany district leader is to give two outings every summer, one for the men of his district and the other for the women and children, and a beefsteak dinner and a ball every winter. The scene of the outings is, usually, one of the groves along the Sound.

The ambition of the district leader on these occasions is to demonstrate that his men have broken all records in the matter of eating and drinking. He gives out the exact number of pounds of beef, poultry, butter, etc., that they have consumed and professes to know how many potatoes and ears of corn have been served.

According to his figures, the average eating record of each man at the outing is about ten pounds of beef, two or three chickens, a pound of butter, a half peck of potatoes, and two dozen ears of corn. The drinking records, as given out, are still more phenomenal. For some reason, not yet explained, the district leader thinks that his popularity will be greatly increased if he can show that his followers can eat and drink more than the followers of any other district leader.

The same idea governs the beefsteak dinners in the winter. It matters not what sort of steak is served or how it is cooked; the district leader considers only the question of quantity, and when he excels all others in this particular, he feels somehow, that he is a bigger man and deserves more patronage than his associates in the Tammany Executive Committee.

As to the balls, they are the events of the winter in the extreme East Side and West Side society. Mamie and Maggie and Jennie prepare for them months in advance, and their young men save up for the occasion just as they save for the summer trips to Coney Island.

The district leader is in his glory at the opening of the ball. He leads the cotillion with the prettiest woman present--his wife, if he has one, permitting--and spends almost the whole night shaking

> hands with his constituents. The ball costs him a pretty penny, but he has found that the investment pays.
>
> By these means the Tammany district leader reaches out into the homes of his district, keeps watch not only on the men, but also on the women and children; knows their needs, their likes and dislikes, their troubles and their hopes, and places himself in a position to use his knowledge for the benefit of his organization and himself. Is it any wonder that scandals do not permanently disable Tammany and that it speedily recovers from what seems to be crushing defeat?

To be sure, most neighborhood associations of the kind that we have been discussing will want to remain non-partisan. Yet the traditions invoked by Tammany Leaders were non-partisan as well. Moreover, just as a union will remind its members of early labor pioneers, so a community association should remind members of as much history and tradition within the neighborhood as it can recall. Ultimately, the organization should establish its own little traditions: the annual meeting, the community fair, the awards banquet for neighborhood service, even songs and slogans. Justice is more than a program to meet material needs. As an ideal, it must capture our imagination through all the symbols that help give us continuity and meaning.

F. The Fellowship of Justice

Before starting an organization, activists and organizers probably will be skeptical and unsure about what they can accomplish. Questions like, "if people wanted to organize, why haven't they done so up to now." will go through their minds. As they travel door to door, they will find many people who say they aren't interested, or who say that they are but don't seem to mean it. These responses are always discouraging.

What often surprises the organizers, however, is not the people who stay away from the first meeting, but the number who come. Even an attractive leaflet distributed door-to-door in an unorganized neighborhood--one that talks about serious problems like crime and abandoned houses--can bring out 50 to 100 local residents. It is not before a meeting that the organization fails. It is at the meeting and afterwards, if the organizers have no clear idea how to involve and sustain residents in the process of continuing change.

The initial willingness of neighborhood residents to come to a community meeting should tell us how anxious many of them are to become involved. If an organizer sees problems, so do many of them. If an organizer enjoys getting together with people, so do many of them. If an organizer has grown up believing in justice, so have many of them. The only difference between

the organizer and the community lies in their assessments of whether these ideals can be achieved. The organizer has confidence in what organizations can do; the people often must be shown.

For all our rhetoric of democracy, modern bureaucracies have not given many of us the feeling that our highest common ideals depend upon continuing participation in all areas of civic life. Instead, we hear that hard work, obedience, and "expertise" can provide us with all aspects of security and success. Even if our technology were able to guarantee this kind of social arrangement, it still would not satisfy many basic human needs, however. As Plato and Aristotle told us over 24 centuries ago, we are social and political animals. We can imagine goodness, beauty and truth, but we know that by ourselves we are powerless even to contemplate achieving them. We reach out to others, emotionally and intellectually. We aspire to build community.

These sessions have offered a few preliminary notions about the process of building community in urban neighborhoods. We have discussed immediate and long-range problems of security, reciprocity, and fellowship. We have argued that common activity succeeds only to the extent that people discover and share a common ideal of justice. In this regard, we should consider ourselves fortunate. Americans do learn to respect justice, at least in principle. We grow up uttering a pledge of "liberty and justice" for all. Some of our greatest heroes are those who distinguished themselves in trying to make this dream a human reality--Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Abraham Lincoln, John L. Lewis, and Martin Luther King. "Citizenship is the American ideal," G.K. Chesterton commented many years ago. "There may be an army of actualities opposed to that ideal, but there is no ideal opposed to the ideal."

Thus, there is a fellowship of justice in the United States, if only in the standards that we set for ourselves and in the common objects of our deepest love. Perhaps the key to realizing this fellowship lies in recognizing that in a democracy, it is we who are the heroes, upon whose common efforts the success or failure of our dreams ultimately depends.

Footnotes

1. De Tocqueville, Democracy in America,(New York, Vintage, 1945), Volume 2, p. 117.

2. Jean Jacques Rousseau, Social Contract, G.D.H. Cole, Editor,

(New York, E.E. Dutton, 1950), p. 40.

3. Rousseau, "A Discourse on Political Economy," Ibid.

4. John Winthrop, "Modell of Christian Charity," reprinted in Perry Miller and Thomas J. Johnson, Editors, The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings, Volume I, (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1963), pp. 195-199, passim.

5. Declaration of Independence

6. United States Constitution

7. Rousseau, op. cit., p. 301.

8. John Winthrop, op. cit.

9. Cooperative Community Development, Joe Falk, Editor, The Future Associates, 1975, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, pp. 51-56.

10. Ibid.

11. Saul Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals, (New York, Vintage, 1969), pp. 132-146, 152-54. Reprinted by Permission of the Publisher

12. Wilson C. McWilliams, Jr., "Communitarianism vs. Liberalism: Does it Make Any Difference," Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 1975, p. 28.

13. DeTocqueville, op. cit., Volume II, Second Book, Chapter VII, pp. 123-124.

14. William Riordan, Editor, Plunkitt of Tamman Hall,(New York, E.P. Dutton, 1963), pp. 69-70.

15. Ibid., PP. 25-28; 90-98.

G. Questions for Discussion

1. Review the questions for a justice "Dialogue on What Could Be?" on page 6. Would these be good questions to raise at a first meeting of neighborhood residents? Why or why not? What injustices do you think would be mentioned most frequently?

2. How willing would residents be to engage in conflict with established institutions to achieve goals that they think of as being just? What steps would have to be taken before they would engage in the sort of conflict described by Saul Alinsky?

3. How aware are residents of the history of their neighborhood

community? How many lived in the neighborhood all their lives? How many are newcomers? What impact do these residential patterns have on fellowship in the neighborhood?

4. If you had to list the national heroes whose work for justice would inspire neighborhood residents, who would they be? How about historical figures? How can the work and memory of these people be brought to bear in promoting fellowship in your neighborhood?

5. What sort of regular activities do you think your community association should sponsor to promote fellowship around justice? Describe each event.

H. For Further Reading

Cooperative Community Development. Joe Falk, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, 1975.

Reveille for Radicals, Saul Alinsky, New York, Vintage, 1968.

Plunkitt of Tammany Hall. William Riordin, New York, E.P. Dutton, 1963.

The Uses of Disorder. Richard Sennett, New York, Vintage, 1970.

Signs of Shalom. Edward Powers, United Church of Christ Press, 1973.